arXiv:1212.5820v1 [math.DS] 23 Dec 2012

MULTIFRACTAL ANALYSIS OF BIRKHOFF AVERAGES FOR TYPICAL INFINITELY GENERATED SELF-AFFINE SETS

ANTTI KÄENMÄKI AND HENRY WJ REEVE

Abstract. We develop a thermodynamic formalism for quasi-multiplicative potentials on a countable symbolic space and apply these results to the dimension theory of infinitely generated self-affine sets. The first application is a generalisation of Falconer's dimension formula to include typical infinitely generated self-affine sets and show the existence of an ergodic invariant measure of full dimension whenever the pressure function has a root. Considering the multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages of general potentials Φ taking values in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we give a formula for the Hausdorff dimension of $J_\Phi(\alpha)$, the α-level set of the Birkhoff average, on a typical infinitely generated self-affine set. We also show that for bounded potentials Φ, the Hausdorff dimension of $J_\Phi(\alpha)$ is given by the maximum of the critical value for the pressure and the supremum of Lyapunov dimensions of invariant measures μ for which $\int \Phi \, d\mu = \alpha$. Our multifractal results are new in both the finitely generated and the infinitely generated setting.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Preliminaries and statement of results 2
2.1. Thermodynamic formalism for sub-multiplicative potentials 2
2.2. Infinitely generated self-affine sets 4
2.3. Multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages 6
3. Thermodynamic formalism for quasi-multiplicative potentials 7
3.1. Existence of Gibbs measures 7
3.2. Variational principle 10
3.3. Differentiation of pressure 11
4. Dimension of infinitely generated self-affine sets 12
5. Multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages 14
5.1. Proof of the upper bound in Theorem C 14
5.2. Symbolic tree structure in level sets 16
6. Conditional variational principle for bounded potentials 24
6.1. Space of integrals with respect to invariant measures 24
6.2. Upper bound for interior points of the spectrum 25
6.3. Quasi upper-semicontinuity lemma 27
6.4. Finitely many potentials lemma 29
6.5. Proof of the upper bound in Theorem D 31
6.6. Proof of the lower bound in Theorem D 33
References 34

Date: December 27, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 28A80; Secondary 37D35.

Key words and phrases. Multifractal analysis, self-affine set, infinite iterated function system, thermodynamic formalism.

HWJ Reeve would like to thank his supervisor Dr. Thomas Jordan for all of his help and guidance.

1. Introduction

Let F be the repeller of a piecewise smooth map $f\colon X \to X$. Given a continuous potential $\varphi\colon F \to \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we are interested in the set of points in the repeller for which the Birkhoff average converges to α,

$$J_\varphi(\alpha) = \{x \in F : \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(f^i(x)) = \alpha\}. \tag{1.1}$$

The central question in the multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages is to determine the Hausdorff dimension of the level sets $J_\varphi(\alpha)$. For conformal expanding maps on compact repellers the Hausdorff dimension is given by a well known conditional variational principle; see e.g. Pesin and Weiss [31], Fan, Feng and Wu [10], Barreira and Saussol [3], Feng, Lau and Wu [18] and Olsen [29, 30].

Situations in which either the map f is non-conformal or the repeller F is non-compact are far less well understood. Thus far most work on non-conformal systems has focused on maps which are obtained as skew products of conformal systems; see e.g. Barral and Mensi [2], Barral and Feng [1] and Reeve [32, 33]. Jordan and Simon [24] have given a conditional variational principle for typical members of parameterizable families of self-affine iterated function systems with a simultaneously diagonalizable linear part.

Recently there has also been a great deal of work dealing with cases in which the repeller F is a non-compact limit set of a countable collection of contractions; see e.g. [9, 11, 13, 12, 20, 22, 27, 28, 33]. All but one of these results have concerned situations in which the map f is conformal. The only exception being [33] which deals with a family of skew products including the direct product of the Gauss map and the doubling map.

There are two facts concerning the the space of invariant measures for a continuous map of a compact metric space which make the dimension theory of compact systems a great deal easier to handle. The first is that if the space itself is compact, then the space of invariant probability measures is also compact. Thus given a sequence of invariant measures one can always extract a convergent subsequence. The second fact is that for compact systems entropy is an upper-semicontinuous function on the space of invariant measures, so given a sequence of invariant measures one may extract a weak star limit point with entropy equal to the limit superior of the entropies of the measures in the sequence. Since in our setting the underlying space $\mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N}$ is non-compact the main challenge comes from the lack of these two facts.

The article is organized as follows. In §2, we exhibit and motivate the results, and in §3–6, we provide the reader with all the necessary details.

2. Preliminaries and statement of results

2.1. Thermodynamic formalism for sub-multiplicative potentials.

Define $\Sigma = \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N}$ to be the set of all infinite words constructed from the integers. Let $\Sigma_n = \mathbb{N}^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Sigma_* = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$ be the collection of all finite word. If $\omega \in \Sigma_*$ and $\tau \in \Sigma_* \cup \Sigma$, then $\omega\tau$ denotes the concatenation of ω and τ. Furthermore, if $\omega \in \Sigma_* \cup \Sigma$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\omega|_n$ is the unique word in Σ_n for which there is $\tau \in \Sigma$ so that $\omega|_n\tau = \omega$. If $\omega, \tau \in \Sigma_* \cup \Sigma$, then by $\omega \wedge \tau$ we mean the common beginning of ω and τ. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in \Sigma_n$ we set $|\omega| = n$ and define the cylinder set given by ω to be $[\omega] = \{\omega\tau : \tau \in \Sigma\}$. We denote the left shift operator by σ and let $\mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ be the set of all σ-invariant Borel probability measures on Σ.

We equip Σ with the discrete topology and call it a *shift space*. If the shift space is constructed by using a finite alphabet, i.e. $\Sigma = I^\mathbb{N}$ for some finite set $I \subset \mathbb{N}$, then we say that the shift space is *finitely generated*. The shift space is compact if and only if it is finitely generated. Moreover, the cylinder sets are open and closed and they generate the Borel σ-algebra.

We shall consider maps $\varphi\colon \Sigma_* \to (0,\infty)$. We refer to such maps as *potentials*. We say that a potential φ is *sub-multiplicative* if

$$\varphi(\omega\tau) \le \varphi(\omega)\varphi(\tau).$$

for all $\omega, \tau \in \Sigma_*$. A sub-multiplicative φ potential is said to be *quasi-multiplicative* if there exist a constant $c \geq 1$ and a finite subset $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_*$ such that for any given pair $\omega, \tau \in \Sigma_*$ there exists $\kappa \in \Gamma$ with

$$\varphi(\omega)\varphi(\tau) \leq c\varphi(\omega\kappa\tau). \tag{2.1}$$

We also define $K = \max\{|\omega| : \omega \in \Gamma\} + 1$. A sub-multiplicative φ potential is said to be *almost-multiplicative* if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\varphi(\omega)\varphi(\tau) \leq c\varphi(\omega\tau).$$

for all $\omega, \tau \in \Sigma_*$. We note that quasi-multiplicativity is significantly less restrictive than the conditon of almost-multiplicativity which also appears in the literature; see e.g. Iommi and Yayama [21].

If φ is a sub-multiplicative potential, then we define the *pressure* $P(\varphi)$ by setting

$$P(\varphi) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{n} \log Z_n(\varphi) = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tfrac{1}{n} \log Z_n(\varphi),$$

where $Z_n(\varphi) = \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n} \varphi(\omega)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that by the sub-multiplicativity, the pressure is well-defined, although it may not be finite. It is immediate that $P(\varphi) = \infty$ if and only if $Z_n(\varphi) = \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, if the shift space is finitely generated, then $P(\varphi) < \infty$. Observe that even if the shift space is finitely generated, the pressure can be negative infinity. Let $\psi\colon \Sigma_* \to (0,\infty)$ be a sub-multiplicative potential so that $P(\psi) < \infty$ and $Z_{n+m}(\psi) \geq cZ_n(\psi)Z_m(\psi)$ for some constant $c > 0$. If the shift space is finitely generated, then the potential $\psi \equiv 1$ satisfies these assumptions. Now defining $\varphi\colon \Sigma_* \to (0,\infty)$ by setting $\varphi(\omega) = (cZ_n(\psi)n!)^{-1}\psi(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Sigma_*$, it is easy to see that φ is sub-multiplicative with $P(\varphi) = -\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log n! = -\infty$.

We let $\mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ denote the set of all σ-invariant Borel probability measures on Σ. Given $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ along with a sub-multiplicative potential φ, we define the *measure-theoretical pressure* $P_\mu(\varphi)$ by setting

$$P_\mu(\varphi) = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tfrac{1}{n} \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n} \mu([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])}. \tag{2.2}$$

We adopt the usual convention according to which $0\log(x/0) = 0 \log 0 = 0$ for all $x > 0$.

Lemma 2.1. *If φ is a sub-multiplicative potential and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$, then*

$$P_\mu(\varphi) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{n} \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n} \mu([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from the standard theory of sub-additive sequences by the sub-multiplicativity of φ, the concavity of the function $H(x) = -x\log x$, and the invariance of μ. □

Furthermore, we define the *Lyapunov exponent* for φ and the *entropy* of μ by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_\mu(\varphi) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{n} \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n} \mu([\omega]) \log\varphi(\omega) = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tfrac{1}{n} \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n} \mu([\omega]) \log\varphi(\omega) \leq \log\|\varphi\|, \\ h_\mu &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{n} \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n} -\mu([\omega]) \log\mu([\omega]) = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tfrac{1}{n} \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n} -\mu([\omega]) \log\mu([\omega]) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

respectively. Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 2.1, we see that the Lyapunov exponent and the entropy are well-defined by the sub-multiplicativity of φ and the invariance of μ.

Lemma 2.2. *If φ is a sub-multiplicative potential, then*

$$P(\varphi) \geq P_\mu(\varphi)$$

for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$. Furthermore, if $h_\mu < \infty$ or $\Lambda_\mu(\varphi)$ is finite, then $P_\mu(\varphi) = h_\mu + \Lambda_\mu(\varphi)$.

Proof. To show the first claim, we may assume that $P_\mu(\varphi) > -\infty$ and $P(\varphi) < \infty$. Thus $\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n}\mu([\omega])\log\varphi(\omega)/\mu([\omega]) > -\infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $Z_n(\varphi) < \infty$ for all $n \ge n_0$. For each $n \ge n_0$ and $C_n \subset \Sigma_n$ we use the concavity of the function $H(x) = -x\log x$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\omega\in C_n}\mu([\omega])\biggl(\log\frac{\varphi(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])} - \log\sum_{\omega\in C_n}\varphi(\omega)\biggr) &= \sum_{\omega\in C_n}\beta(\omega)H\bigl(\mu([\omega])/\beta(\omega)\bigr)\\ &\le H\biggl(\sum_{\omega\in C_n}\beta(\omega)\mu([\omega])/\beta(\omega)\biggr) \in [0,\tfrac{1}{e}],\end{aligned}\tag{2.4}$$

where $\beta(\omega) = \varphi(\omega)/\sum_{\omega\in C_n}\varphi(\omega)$. Dividing by n before letting $n\to\infty$ proves the first claim.

To show the second claim, we first assume that $\Lambda_\mu(\varphi)$ is finite. Notice first that if $h_\mu < \infty$, then also $P_\mu(\varphi) = h_\mu + \Lambda_\mu(\varphi)$ is finite. On the other hand, if $P_\mu(\varphi) < \infty$, then there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$-\infty < \Lambda_\mu(\varphi) \le \tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n}\mu([\omega])\log\varphi(\omega) \text{ and } \tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n}\mu([\omega])\log\frac{\varphi(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])} \le P_\mu(\varphi) + 1 < \infty$$

for all $n \ge n_0$. Thus

$$\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n} -\mu([\omega])\log\mu([\omega]) \le P_\mu(\varphi) - \Lambda_\mu(\varphi) + 1$$

for all $n \ge n_0$ and $h_\mu < \infty$. Therefore, if $h_\mu = \infty$, then $P_\mu(\varphi) = \infty$ and the desired equality holds.

Finally, we notice that the proof of the second claim in the case $h_\mu < \infty$ is similar. □

Our first main result is the following variational principle. The proof of the result can be found in the end of §3.2.

Theorem A. *If φ is a quasi-multiplicative potential, then*

$$P(\varphi) = \sup\{P_\mu(\varphi) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)\}.$$

Moreover, if $P(\varphi) < \infty$, then there exists a unique invariant measure μ for which $P(\varphi) = P_\mu(\varphi)$.

If the shift space is finitely generated, then we always have $P_\mu(\varphi) = h_\mu + \Lambda_\mu(\varphi)$. Moreover, the variational principle holds for all sub-multiplicative potentials; see Käenmäki [25, Theorem 2.6] and Cao, Feng, and Huang [5, Theorem 1.1]. Quasi-multiplicativity has been a crucial property in the study of Lyapunov exponents for products of matrices; see e.g. Feng and Lau [17], Feng [14], and Feng and Käenmäki [16]. It has also been used in connection with finitely generated self-affine sets; see Feng [15] and Falconer and Sloan [6]. Finally, we remark that in the infinitely generated setting, Iommi and Yayama [21, Theorem 3.1] have recently verified the variational principle for almost-multiplicative potentials.

2.2. **Infinitely generated self-affine sets.** Let $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ be such that $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\|T_i\| < 1$. Define $\mathbf{A} = ([0,1]^d)^{\mathbb{N}}$ and note that by the Kolmogorov extension theorem $\mathbf{A}$ supports a natural probability measure $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}} = (\mathcal{L}^d|_{[0,1]^d})^{\mathbb{N}}$. To each sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbf{A}$ we associate a *projection* $\pi_{\mathbf{a}} \colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by

$$\pi_{\mathbf{a}}(\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} T_{\omega|_{j-1}}a_j.$$

Here $T_\omega = T_{\omega_1}\cdots T_{\omega_n}$ for all $\omega = \omega_1\cdots\omega_n \in \Sigma_n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The set $F = F_{\mathbf{a}} = \pi_{\mathbf{a}}(\Sigma)$ is termed *self-affine.*

The dimension theory of self-affine sets of this form was first investigated in the finitely generated setting by Falconer [7]. A central tool in Falconer's analysis was the singular value function φ^s. Given a matrix $T \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})$ we let $1 > \gamma_1(T) \ge \cdots \ge \gamma_d(T) > 0$ denote the singular values of T (the square roots of the eigenvalues of T^*T), in non-increasing order of magnitude. Thus

$\gamma_1(T) = \|T\|$ and $\gamma_d(T) = \|T^{-1}\|^{-1}$. If $0 \le s = m + \delta \le d$ with $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 < \delta \le 1$, then we define the *singular value function* to be

$$\varphi^s(T) = \gamma_1(T) \cdots \gamma_m(T)\gamma_{m+1}(T)^\delta.$$

When $s \ge d$, we set $\varphi^s(t) = |\det(T)|^{s/d}$ for completeness. Given $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ the singular value function introduces a potential by setting

$$\varphi^s(\omega) = \varphi^s(T_\omega) \tag{2.5}$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma_*$. Note that $\|\varphi^s\| \le 1$ for all $0 \le s \le d$. Singular values γ_i introduce potentials in a similar way. For example, if $s \ge 0$, then γ_1^s is the sub-multiplicative potential $\omega \mapsto \|T_\omega\|^s$.

Falconer [7, Lemma 2.1] showed that the singular value function is φ^s is sub-multiplicative. It follows that the corresponding sub-multiplicative pressure $P(\varphi^s)$ is well-defined. Following the proof of [26, Lemma 2.1], we see that the function $s \mapsto P(\varphi^s)$ is strictly decreasing and thus finite on an interval I of $[0, \infty)$. Furthermore, it is convex on connected components of $I \setminus \{1, \dots, d\}$. Note that also the functions $s \mapsto P_\mu(\varphi^s)$ and $s \mapsto \Lambda_\mu(\varphi^s)$ are strictly decreasing and continuous for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$.

Falconer [7, Theorem 5.3] proved that given finitely many affine contractions with contraction ratios at most $\frac{1}{3}$ the Hausdorff dimension of the corresponding self-affine set $F_{\mathbf{a}}$ is given by the unique zero of $s \mapsto P(\varphi^s)$ for almost every translation vector $\mathbf{a}$. Later Solomyak extended Falconer's proof to self-affine sets with the contraction ratios up to $\frac{1}{2}$; see [34, Proposition 3.1(i)]. See Käenmäki [25, Theorem 4.5] and Jordan, Pollicott and Simon [23, Theorem 1.7] for corresponding results for measures. In order to extend Falconer's result to infinitely generated self-affine sets we have to assume that the singular value function is quasi-multiplicative. Let us next analyse the generality of this assumption.

Proposition 2.3. *The singular value function φ^s is quasi-multiplicative for all $0 \le s \le d$ if $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies one of the following conditions:*

(1) Suppose that $d = 2$ and for every line $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^2$ there is $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $T_i(\ell) \ne \ell$.

(2) Suppose that $d = 2$ and the matrices T_i have strictly positive entries so that the ratio of the smallest and largest entry of T_i is uniformly bounded away from zero for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

(3) Suppose that $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T_i = \operatorname{diag}(t_1^i, \dots, t_d^i)$, where $1 > |t_1^i| > \cdots > |t_d^i| > 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Assuming (1), [14, Proposition 2.8] shows that the potential γ_1 is quasi-multiplicative. Observe that the proof of [14, Proposition 2.8] applies verbatim in the infinite case. Similarly, assuming (2), [21, Lemma 7.1] shows that γ_1 is quasi-multiplicative. The claim in both of these cases follows now by recalling that the determinant is the product of singular values. Finally, assuming (3), the quasi-multiplicativity of the singular value function is immediate. ☐

Remark 2.4. (1) The assumption (1) in Proposition 2.3 is equivalent to the property that the matrices do not have a common eigenvector. Thus, if the 2×2 matrices cannot simultaneously be presented (in some coordinate system) as upper triangular matrices, then the singular value function φ^s is quasi-multiplicative for all $0 \le s \le d$.

(2) The set of $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_2(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the assumption (1) in Proposition 2.3 is open and dense set under the product topology. Indeed the set of pairs $(T_1, T_2) \in GL_2(\mathbb{R})^2$ for which there is no common eigenvector is easily seen to be an open and dense set of full Lebesgue measure.

(3) Falconer and Sloan [6] have introduced a certain condition under which the singular value function is quasi-multiplicative also in higher dimensions; see [6, Corollary 2.3].

Example 2.5. Two strictly positive 2×2 matrices having a common eigenvector show that strict positivity does not imply irreducibility. Furthermore, if

$$T_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 10 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 10 & 11 \end{pmatrix},$$

then (T_1, T_2) is irreducible, but it is easy to see that there is no coordinate system in which the matrices are simultaneously strictly positive.

In our second main theorem, we generalise Falconer's dimension result to infinitely generated self-affine sets. The proof of the result can be found in §4.

Theorem B. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *satisfies* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$ *and the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \le s \le d$*, then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(F_{\mathbf{a}}) = \min\{d, \inf\{s : P(\varphi^s) \le 0\}\} = \sup\{\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(\pi_{\mathbf{a}}(I^{\mathbb{N}})) : I \subset \mathbb{N} \text{ is finite}\}$$

for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$*-almost all* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$.

2.3. **Multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages.** We shall consider Birkhoff averages of functions $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$. The vector space $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is endowed with the product topology, so a sequence $(\alpha(n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\alpha(n) = (\alpha_i(n))_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_i(n) = \alpha_i$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Given a function $\phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ we define the *variation* $\mathrm{var}_n\phi$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by

$$\mathrm{var}_n\phi = \sup\{|\phi(\omega) - \phi(\tau)| : [\omega|_n] = [\tau|_n]\}.$$

A function $\phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to have *summable variations* if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{var}_n\phi < \infty$.

We take a sequence $\Phi = (\phi_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of functions $\phi_i\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$, each with summable variations, which we think of as a function from Σ to $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$. In this case, we just say that $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ has *summable variations.* Moreover, if each ϕ_i is bounded, then we say that Φ is *bounded.* We define the *Birkhoff sum* for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by

$$S_n\Phi = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \Phi \circ \sigma^j$$

and the *Birkhoff average* by $A_n\Phi = n^{-1}S_n\Phi$. We define $S_n\phi$ and $A_n\phi$ similarly when $\phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We let the *symbolic level set* to be

$$E_\Phi(\alpha) = \{\omega \in \Sigma : \lim_{n\to\infty} A_n\Phi(\omega) = \alpha\}$$

for all $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathbb{N}}$, where $\overline{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$.

Suppose we have a self-affine set $F_{\mathbf{a}}$, that is, $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ is such that $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$, $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in A$, and $F_{\mathbf{a}} = \pi_{\mathbf{a}}(\Sigma)$ is the projection of the shift space. Let us denote the affine maps $x \mapsto T_ix + a_i$ by f_i. If the sequence $\mathbf{a}$ is such that there is a compact set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ so that $f_i(X) \subset X$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_i(X) \cap f_j(X) = \emptyset$ for $i \ne j$, then the projection $\pi_{\mathbf{a}}$ gives a conjugacy between the left shift $\sigma\colon \Sigma \to \Sigma$ and the well-defined map $g\colon \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} f_i(X) \to X$ for which $g(x) = f_i^{-1}(x) = T_i^{-1}x - a_i$ for $x \in f_i(X)$. Thus, in view of (1.1), this leads us to consider the projections of symbolic level sets,

$$J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha) = \pi_{\mathbf{a}}(E_\Phi(\alpha)),$$

for as many $\mathbf{a} \in A$ as possible.

Next we state our main results concerning multifractal formalism in this paper. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we let $\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma)$ denote the set of all σ^k-invariant Borel probability measures and define $\mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma)$ to be the collection of all measures $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma)$ which are compactly supported. If $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma)$, then we let $D_k(\mu)$ to be the unique $s \ge 0$ satisfying

$$\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k} \mu([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi^s(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])} = 0.$$

The potential φ^s here is the singular value function defined in (2.5). We also set

$$D(\mu) = \inf\{s : P_\mu(\varphi^s) \le 0 \text{ and } \Lambda_\mu(\varphi^s) > -\infty\}$$

for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ and call it a *Lyapunov dimension* of μ. Given $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ we define an indexed family of neighbourhoods by

$$B_n(\alpha) = \begin{cases} (-\infty, -n)\,, & \text{if } \alpha = -\infty, \\ \left(\alpha - \frac{1}{n}, \alpha + \frac{1}{n}\right), & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (-\infty, -n)\,, & \text{if } \alpha = \infty. \end{cases}$$

We have two main results concerning multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages. In the first one, we consider general potentials and in the second one, we restrict our analysis to bounded potentials.

Theorem C. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$*, the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \le s \le d$*,* $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *has summable variations, and* $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathbb{N}}$*, then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J^{\mathbf{a}}_{\Phi}(\alpha)) = \min\bigl\{d, \lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} \sup\bigl\{D_k(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int A_k(\phi_i)d\mu \in B_n(\alpha_i) \text{ for all } i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}\bigr\}\bigr\}$$

for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$*-almost all* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$*.*

The proof of Theorem C is given in §5. Theorem D, our second result on multifractal formalism, generalises the theorem of Fan, Jordan, Liao and Rams [11, Theorem 1.2] to the self-affine setting. Define $s_\infty = \inf\{s : P(\varphi^s) < \infty\}$ and $\mathcal{P}(\Phi) = \{\int \Phi d\mu : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)\}$, and let $\overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$ be the closure of $\mathcal{P}(\Phi)$ with respect to the pointwise topology.

Theorem D. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$*, the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \le s \le d$*,* $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is bounded with summable variations, and* $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$*, then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J^{\mathbf{a}}_{\Phi}(\alpha)) = \min\bigl\{d, \max\bigl\{s_\infty, \sup\{D(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int \Phi d\mu = \alpha\}\bigr\}\bigr\}$$

for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$*-almost all* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$*. Furthermore, if* $\alpha \notin \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$*, then* $J^{\mathbf{a}}_{\Phi}(\alpha) = \emptyset$ *for all* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$*.*

The proof of Theorem D is presented in §6.

3. THERMODYNAMIC FORMALISM FOR QUASI-MULTIPLICATIVE POTENTIALS

3.1. **Existence of Gibbs measures.** Suppose we have a sub-multiplicative potential φ along with a subset $I \subset \mathbb{N}$. We define the *pressure* $P(\varphi, I)$ by

$$P(\varphi, I) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{n} \log Z_n(\varphi, I) = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tfrac{1}{n} \log Z_n(\varphi, I),$$

where $Z_n(\varphi, I) = \sum_{\omega\in I^n} \varphi(\omega)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $Z_n(\varphi, \mathbb{N}) = Z_n(\varphi)$ and $P(\varphi, \mathbb{N}) = P(\varphi)$. Observe that $Z_n(\varphi, I) \le Z_n(\varphi, I)$ and hence also $P(\varphi, J) \le P(\varphi, I)$ for all $J \subset I \subset \mathbb{N}$. If $C \ge 1$, then an invariant probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ is said to be a *C-Gibbs measure for the potential φ on I* if it is supported on $I^{\mathbb{N}}$, the pressure $P(\varphi, I)$ is finite, and

$$C^{-1} \le \frac{\mu([\omega])}{\varphi(\omega)\exp(-nP(\varphi, I))} \le C$$

for all $\omega \in I^n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. An invariant measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ is said to be a *Gibbs measure for the potential φ on I* if there exists some $C \ge 1$ such that μ is a C-Gibbs measure for the potential φ on I. Finally, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ is said to be a *Gibbs measure for the potential φ* if μ is a Gibbs measure for the potential φ on $\mathbb{N}$.

In this section, our main goal is to show that if φ is a quasi-multiplicative potential with finite pressure, then φ has a Gibbs measure. We remark that this is not the case for all sub-multiplicative potentials; see [26, Example 6.4] for a counter-example in a finitely generated self-affine set. For a given quasi-multiplicative potential, throughout the section, we let $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_*$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, and $c \ge 1$ be as in the definition of the quasi-multiplicative potential; see (2.1).

Lemma 3.1. *If* φ *is a quasi-multiplicative potential and* $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ *is so that* $\Gamma \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^K I^k$*, then*

$$e^{nP(\varphi,I)} \le Z_n(\varphi, I) \le cK \max\{1, e^{KP(\varphi)}\} e^{nP(\varphi,I)}.$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$*. In particular,* $P(\varphi, I) > -\infty$*.*

Proof. Since the left-hand side inequality follows immediately from the definition of the pressure, it suffices to show the right-hand side inequality. Fix $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega_i \in I^n$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. By the quasi-multiplicativity, there are $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_{m-1}$ so that

$$\varphi(\omega_1) \cdots \varphi(\omega_m) \le c^{m-1} \varphi(\omega_1 \kappa_1 \omega_2 \kappa_2 \cdots \omega_{m-1} \kappa_{m-1} \omega_m).$$

Denoting $\xi_{n,m}(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_m) = \omega_1 \kappa_1 \omega_2 \kappa_2 \cdots \omega_{m-1} \kappa_{m-1} \omega_m$ for all $\omega = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m \in (I^n)^m$ defines a mapping $\xi_{n,m} \colon (I^n)^m \to \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{K(m-1)} I^{nm+l}$ which is at most K^{m-1} to one. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n(\varphi, I)^m = \biggl(\sum_{\omega \in I^n} \varphi(\omega) \biggr)^m &= \sum_{\omega \in (I^n)^m} \prod_{i=1}^m \varphi(\omega_i) \le c^{m-1} \sum_{\omega \in (I^n)^m} \varphi(\xi_{n,m}(\omega)) \\ &\le (cK)^{m-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{K(m-1)} \sum_{\omega \in I^{nm+l}} \varphi(\omega) = (cK)^{m-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{K(m-1)} Z_{nm+l}(\varphi, I). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $\ell_m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $nm \le \ell_m \le (n+K)m$ satisfying $Z_n(\varphi, I)^m \le m(cK)^m Z_{\ell_m}(\varphi, I)$. Hence

$$Z_n(\varphi, I) \le m^{1/m} cK \bigl(Z_{\ell_m}(\varphi, I)^{1/\ell_m} \bigr)^{\ell_m/m} \to \begin{cases} cK e^{(n+K)P(\varphi,I)}, & \text{if } P(\varphi, I) > 0, \\ cK e^{nP(\varphi,I)}, & \text{if } P(\varphi, I) \le 0, \end{cases}$$

by letting $m \to \infty$. The proof follows since $P(\varphi, I) \le P(\varphi)$. □

The following proposition is a finite approximation property for the pressure. It is a crucial property in our analysis since it makes it possible to construct a Gibbs measure on an infinitely generated shift space via its finitely generated sub-spaces.

Proposition 3.2. *If $(I_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of non-empty finite sets $I_\ell \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $I_\ell \subset I_{\ell+1}$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\mathbb{N} = \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} I_\ell$, then*

$$P(\varphi) = \lim_{\ell \to \infty} P(\varphi, I_\ell)$$

for all quasi-multiplicative potentials φ. In particular, $P(\varphi) = \sup\{P(\varphi, I) : I \subset \mathbb{N} \text{ is finite}\}$.

Proof. Recall that $P(\varphi, I_\ell) \le P(\varphi, I_{\ell+1}) \le P(\varphi)$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix $\varrho < P(\varphi)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $P = \lim_{\ell \to \infty} P(\varphi, I_\ell)$. Since $\varrho < \frac{1}{n} \log Z_n(\varphi)$, we may choose $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\Gamma \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^K I_\ell^k$ and $\varrho < \frac{1}{n} \log Z_n(\varphi, I_\ell)$. By Lemma 3.1, we have $Z_n(\varphi, I_\ell) \le cK \max\{1, e^{KP(\varphi)}\} e^{nP}$ and thus $\varrho < \frac{1}{n}\bigl(\log cK + K|P(\varphi)|\bigr) + P$. The proof is finished by letting $n \to \infty$. □

Lemma 3.3. *If φ is a quasi-multiplicative potential with $P(\varphi) < \infty$, then there exists a constant $C \ge 1$ such that for each $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\Gamma \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^K I^k$ we have*

$$C^{-1} e^{(n+m)P(\varphi,I)} \varphi(\omega) \le \sum_{\kappa \in I^n} \sum_{\tau \in I^m} \varphi(\kappa \omega \tau) \le C e^{(n+m)P(\varphi,I)} \varphi(\omega)$$

for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I^n$.

Proof. The right-hand side inequality follows immediately since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\kappa \in I^n} \sum_{\tau \in I^m} \varphi(\kappa \omega \tau) &\le \sum_{\kappa \in I^n} \sum_{\tau \in I^m} \varphi(\kappa) \varphi(\omega) \varphi(\tau) = \varphi(\omega) Z_n(\varphi, I) Z_m(\varphi, I) \\ &\le \bigl(cK \max\{1, e^{KP(\varphi)}\} \bigr)^2 e^{(n+m)P(\varphi,I)} \varphi(\omega) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3.1.

To show the left-hand side inequality, we first notice that the quasi-multiplicativity implies

$$\varphi(\omega) \varphi(\kappa) \le c \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\alpha \in I^k} \varphi(\omega \alpha \kappa) \tag{3.1}$$

for all $\omega, \kappa \in \Sigma_*$. Applying Lemma 3.1, along with (3.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{(n+m)P(\varphi,I)}\varphi(\omega) &\le Z_n(\varphi,I)\sum_{\kappa\in I^m}\varphi(\omega)\varphi(\kappa) \le cZ_n(\varphi,I)\sum_{\tau\in I^m}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{\alpha\in I^k}\varphi(\omega\alpha\tau)\\
&= cZ_n(\varphi,I)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{\alpha\in I^k}\sum_{\tau\in I^m}\varphi(\omega\tau\alpha) \le cZ_n(\varphi,I)\sum_{k=1}^{K}Z_k(\varphi,I)\sum_{\tau\in I^m}\varphi(\omega\tau)\\
&\le c^2\sum_{k=1}^{K}Z_k(\varphi,I)\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{\alpha\in I^k}\sum_{\kappa\in I^n}\sum_{\tau\in I^m}\varphi(\kappa\alpha\omega\tau)\\
&\le c^2\biggl(\sum_{k=1}^{K}Z_k(\varphi,I)\biggr)^2\sum_{\kappa\in I^n}\sum_{\tau\in I^m}\varphi(\kappa\omega\tau).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is now finished since

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K}Z_k(\varphi,I) \le cK\max\{1,e^{KP(\varphi)}\}\sum_{k=1}^{K}e^{kP(\varphi)} < \infty$$

by Lemma 3.1. □

We are now ready to show that every finite sub-space carries a Gibbs measure. Observe that, to be able to extend the result into infinitely generated shift space, it is crucial to find a uniform constant.

Proposition 3.4. *If φ is a quasi-multiplicative potential with $P(\varphi) < \infty$, then there is $C \ge 1$ so that φ has a C-Gibbs measure for φ on I for all finite subsets $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\Gamma \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{K} I^k$.*

Proof. Let $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a finite subset with $\Gamma \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{K} I^k$. Given a finite word $\omega \in \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} I^n$ we choose $\tilde{\omega} \in [\omega] \cap I^{\mathbb{N}}$ and let δ_ω denote the point mass concentrated at $\tilde{\omega}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define a probability measure ν_n on Σ by

$$\nu_n = Z_{3n}(\varphi,I)^{-1}\sum_{\omega\in I^{3n}}\varphi(\omega)\delta_\omega.$$

Note that ν_n is supported on $I^{\mathbb{N}}$. If $m, \ell \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ and $\omega \in I^m$, then

$$\nu_n \circ \sigma^{-\ell}([\omega]) = \sum_{\kappa\in I^\ell}\sum_{\tau\in I^{3n-\ell-m}}\nu_n([\kappa\omega\tau]) = Z_{3n}(\varphi,I)^{-1}\sum_{\kappa\in I^\ell}\sum_{\tau\in I^{3n-\ell-m}}\varphi(\kappa\omega\tau).$$

According to Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3 there exists a constant $C \ge 1$ so that

$$C^{-1}e^{-mP(\varphi,I)}\varphi([\omega]) \le \nu_n \circ \sigma^{-\ell}([\omega]) \le Ce^{-mP(\varphi,I)}\varphi(\omega) \tag{3.2}$$

for all finite subsets $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\Gamma \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{K} I^k$. Observe that the above estimate remains true if we replace $\nu_n \circ \sigma^{-\ell}$ by the probability measure

$$\mu_n = \tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{\ell=1}^{n}\nu_n \circ \sigma^{-\ell}. \tag{3.3}$$

Since I is finite and each μ_n is supported on the compact set $I^{\mathbb{N}}$, there is a convergent subsequence $(\mu_{n_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ converging to some limit μ in the weak* topology. It follows from (3.3) that μ is a σ-invariant probability measure. Moreover, by (3.2), μ is a C-Gibbs measure for φ on I. □

Theorem 3.5. *If φ is a quasi-multiplicative potential with $P(\varphi) < \infty$, then φ has a Gibbs measure μ. Moreover, there is $C \ge 1$ so that for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ there are a finite set $I_\ell \subset \mathbb{N}$ and a C-Gibbs measure μ_ℓ for φ on I_ℓ such that $P(\varphi, I_\ell) \to P(\varphi)$ and $\mu_\ell \to \mu$ in the weak* topology.*

Proof. Let $(I_\ell)_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of non-empty finite sets $I_\ell \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $I_\ell \subset I_{\ell+1}$ and $\Gamma \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^K I_\ell^k$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{N} = \bigcup_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} I_\ell$. Recalling Proposition 3.2, we have $\lim_{\ell\to\infty} P(\varphi, I_\ell) = P(\varphi)$. By Proposition 3.4, there exist a constant $C \geq 1$ and for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ a σ-invariant probability measure $\mu_\ell \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ so that

$$C^{-1} \leq \frac{\mu_\ell([\omega])}{\varphi(\omega)\exp(-nP(\varphi, I_\ell))} \leq C \tag{3.4}$$

for all $\omega \in I_\ell^n$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. It suffices to show that the sequence $(\mu_\ell)_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight, that is, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $K \subset \Sigma$ for which $\mu_\ell(K) > 1 - \varepsilon$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the sequence $(\mu_\ell)_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}}$ has a converging subsequence and it follows from (3.4) that the limit measure of that subsequence is a Gibbs measure for φ.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and notice that $\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \varphi(i) = Z_1(\varphi) \leq Ce^{P(\varphi)} < \infty$ by Lemma 3.1. Thus, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a finite subset $I_k \subset \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}\setminus I_k} \varphi(i) < \varepsilon 2^{-k} C^{-1} e^{P(\varphi, I_1)} \leq \varepsilon 2^{-k} C^{-1} e^{P(\varphi, I_\ell)}$$

for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. We define $K = \{\omega \in \Sigma : \omega_k \in I_k \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. It follows from (3.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_\ell(K) &= \mu_\ell\Big(\Sigma \setminus \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \{\omega \in \Sigma : \omega_k \notin I_k\}\Big) = 1 - \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mu_\ell(\{\omega \in \Sigma : \omega_k \notin I_k\}) \\ &= 1 - \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}\setminus I_k} \mu_\ell\big(\sigma^{-k}([i])\big) = 1 - \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}\setminus I_k} \mu_\ell([i]) \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}\setminus I_k} Ce^{-P(\varphi, I_\ell)} \varphi(i) > 1 - \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 2^{-k}\varepsilon = 1 - \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. □

3.2. **Variational principle.**

We shall study the properties of the Gibbs measure found in Theorem 3.5. At the end of this section, we prove Theorem A.

Theorem 3.6. *If φ is a quasi-multiplicative potential with $P(\varphi) < \infty$ and μ is a Gibbs measure for φ, then μ is ergodic. In particular, μ is the only Gibbs measure for φ.*

Proof. By (3.1), it is straightforward to see that a C-Gibbs measure μ satisfies

$$\sum_{p,q=1}^{K} \mu\big([\omega] \cap \sigma^{-(n+p+q)}([\tau])\big) \geq c^{-2} C^{-1} e^{-2K|P(\varphi)|} \mu([\omega])\mu([\tau])$$

for all $\omega, \tau \in \Sigma$ and $n \geq |\omega|$. The proof follows now by standard arguments; see e.g. [17, Theorem 3.2]. □

Lemma 3.7. *If φ is a quasi-multiplicative potential with $P(\varphi) < \infty$ and μ is the Gibbs measure for φ on a set $I \subset \mathbb{N}$, then $P(\varphi, I) = P_\mu(\varphi)$.*

Proof. By the definition of a Gibbs measure, we get

$$P_\mu(\varphi) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{n} \sum_{\omega\in I^n} \mu([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{n} \sum_{\omega\in I^n} \mu([\omega]) \log e^{nP(\varphi, I)} = P(\varphi, I)$$

as desired. □

Lemma 3.8. *If φ is a quasi-multiplicative potential with $P(\varphi) < \infty$ and μ is the Gibbs measure for φ, then any measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ with $P(\varphi) \leq P_\nu(\varphi)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ.*

Proof. To prove the claim, we follow the ideas of [4] and [26, Theorem 3.6]. Let μ be a C-Gibbs measure. Assume to the contrary that there exist a measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ with $P(\varphi) \le P_\mu(\varphi)$ and a Borel set $B \subset \Sigma$ so that $\mu(B) = 0$ and $\nu(B) > 0$. Since the semi-algebra of cylinder sets generates the Borel σ-algebra we may choose a sequence of sets $(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that each B_n is a union of cylinders of length n with $(\mu+\nu)(B_n \triangle B) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Let $B'_n = \{\omega \in \Sigma_n : [\omega] \subset B_n\}$. Hence, by (2.2) and (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\le \sum_{\omega\in B'_n} \nu([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi(\omega)}{\nu([\omega])} + \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma\setminus B'_n} \nu([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi(\omega)}{\nu([\omega])} - nP(\varphi) \\
&\le \nu(B_n) \log \sum_{\omega\in\mathcal{B}'_n} \varphi(\omega) + \nu(\Sigma\setminus B_n) \log \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma\setminus\mathcal{B}'_n} \varphi(\omega) - nP(\varphi) + \tfrac{2}{e} \qquad (3.5) \\
&\le \nu(B_n) \log \mu(B_n) + \nu(\Sigma\setminus B_n) \log \mu(\Sigma\setminus B_n) + \log C + \tfrac{2}{e}
\end{aligned}$$

for all n large enough. Since $\nu(B_n) \to \nu(B)$ and $\mu(B_n) \to 0$ the right-hand side of (3.5) tends to $-\infty$ as $n \to \infty$. This contradiction finishes the proof. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem A.

Proof of Theorem A. Let us first assume that $P(\varphi) = \infty$. Let $(I_\ell)_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of non-empty finite sets with $I_\ell \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $\Gamma \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^K I_\ell^k$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{N} = \bigcup_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} I_\ell$. Recalling Proposition 3.4, let μ_ℓ be a Gibbs measure for φ on I_ℓ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Now

$$P(\varphi) = \sup\{P(\varphi, I_\ell) : \ell \in \mathbb{N}\} = \sup\{P_{\mu_\ell}(\varphi) : \ell \in \mathbb{N}\} \le \sup\{P_\mu(\varphi) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)\}$$

by Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 3.7.

If $P(\varphi) < \infty$, then it suffices to prove that a Gibbs measure μ is the only invariant measure for which $P(\varphi) = P_\mu(\varphi)$. Theorem 3.6 shows that μ is ergodic and Lemma 3.7 shows that it satisfies $P(\varphi) = P_\mu(\varphi)$. If $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ is an invariant measure satisfying $P(\varphi) = P_\mu(\varphi)$, then ν is absolutely continuous with respect to μ by Lemma 3.8. It follows from the proof of [35, Theorem 6.10(iii)] that $\nu = \mu$. □

3.3. **Differentiation of pressure.** Given a pair of potentials $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \colon \Sigma_* \to [0,\infty)$ we let $\varphi_1 \cdot \varphi_2$ denote the potential defined by $\omega \mapsto \varphi_1(\omega)\varphi_2(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Sigma_*$. Given a function $\phi \colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ we define an associated potential $e_\phi \colon \Sigma_* \to [0,\infty)$ by setting

$$e_\phi(\omega) = \exp\bigl(\sup\{S_n\phi(\tau) : \tau \in [\omega]\}\bigr)$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma_n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall that $S_n\phi(\tau) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi(\sigma^j(\tau))$ for all $\tau \in \Sigma$.

Lemma 3.9. *If φ is a quasi-multiplicative potential and $\phi \colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ has summable variations, then the potential $\varphi \cdot e_\phi$ is quasi-multiplicative.*

Proof. If $c = \exp(\sum_{n=1}^\infty \mathrm{var}_n(\phi))$, then

$$c^{-1} e_\phi(\omega) e_\phi(\kappa) \le e_\phi(\omega\kappa) \le e_\phi(\omega) e_\phi(\kappa)$$

for all $\omega, \kappa \in \Sigma_*$. The claim follows from the quasi-multiplicativity of φ. □

Lemma 3.10. *If φ is a sub-multiplicative potential with $P(\varphi) < \infty$ and $\phi \colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ is bounded with summable variations, then the function $q \mapsto P(\varphi \cdot e(q\phi))$ is convex.*

Proof. If $q, p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \le \lambda \le 1$, then

$$\varphi(\omega) e_{(\lambda q + (1-\lambda)p)\phi}(\omega) \le \bigl(\varphi(\omega) e_{q\phi}(\omega)\bigr)^\lambda \bigl(\varphi(\omega) e_{p\phi}(\omega)\bigr)^{1-\lambda}$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma_*$. Thus, by Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n} \varphi(\omega) e_{(\lambda q + (1-\lambda)p)\phi}(\omega) \le \Bigl(\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n} \varphi(\omega) e_{q\phi}(\omega)\Bigr)^\lambda \Bigl(\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n} \varphi(\omega) e_{p\phi}(\omega)\Bigr)^{1-\lambda}.$$

Taking logarithms, dividing by n, and letting $n \to \infty$ gives the claim. □

Lemma 3.11. *If φ is a quasi-multiplicative potential with $P(\varphi) < \infty$, μ is the Gibbs measure for φ, and $\phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ is bounded with summable variations, then the function $q \mapsto P(\varphi \cdot e_{q\phi})$ is differentiable at zero with derivative*

$$\frac{\partial P(\varphi \cdot e_{q\phi})}{\partial q}\bigg|_{q=0} = \int \phi d\mu.$$

Proof. To prove the claim, we use some of the ideas used in the proof of [26, Thorem 4.4]. It suffices to show that the right derivative exists at zero and equals to $\int \phi d\mu$ since applying this result with $-\phi$ in place of ϕ gives

$$\lim_{q\uparrow 0} \tfrac{1}{q}\big(P(\varphi \cdot e_{q\phi}) - P(\varphi)\big) = -\lim_{q\downarrow 0} \tfrac{1}{q}\big(P(\varphi \cdot e_{q(-\phi)}) - P(\varphi)\big) = \int \phi d\mu.$$

Throughout the proof of the lemma, to simplify notation, we write $P(q)$ in place of $P(\varphi \cdot e_{q\phi})$. By Lemma 3.10, the function $q \mapsto P(q)$ is convex and hence there is a well-defined right derivative at zero. We shall denote it by $P'_+(0)$.

To prove that $P'_+(0) \le \int \phi d\mu$, take $\beta > \int \phi d\mu$. Define

$$C'_n = \{\omega \in \Sigma_n : S_n\phi(\tau) > n\beta \text{ for some } \tau \in [\omega]\}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $C_n = \bigcup_{\omega \in C'_n} [\omega]$. Since μ is a Gibbs measure for φ there is $C \ge 1$ so that

$$\varphi(\omega) \le Ce^{nP(0)}\mu([\omega]) \tag{3.6}$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma_n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Theorem 3.6, μ is ergodic and thus, we may apply Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, Egorov's theorem, and the fact that ϕ has summable variations, to obtain $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mu(C_n) = 0$.

Fix $\gamma > 0$. Since $P(q)$ is convex we have $P(\gamma/n) \ge P(0) + \gamma/nP'_+(0)$. Using the sub-multiplicativity of $\varphi \cdot e_{\gamma/n\phi}$ and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{nP(0)+\gamma P'_+(0)} \le e^{nP(\gamma/n)} &\le \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_n} \varphi(\omega) \exp(\gamma/n \|S_n(\phi)|_{[\omega]}\|) \\ &\le \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_n \setminus C'_n} \varphi(\omega)e^{\gamma\beta} + \sum_{\omega \in C'_n} \varphi(\omega)e^{\gamma\|\phi\|} \\ &\le Ce^{\gamma\beta}e^{nP(0)}(1-\mu(C_n)) + Ce^{\gamma\|\phi\|}e^{nP(0)}\mu(C_n). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by $e^{nP(0)}$, letting $n \to \infty$, and then $\gamma \to \infty$ gives $P'_+(0) \le \beta$ as desired.

To show that $P'_+(0) \ge \int \phi d\mu$, we use Lemma 2.2 for the sub-multiplicative potential $\varphi \cdot e_{q\phi}$ and Lemma 3.7 for the quasi-multiplicative potential φ to obtain

$$P(q) \ge P_\mu(\varphi \cdot e_{q\phi}) \ge P_\mu(\varphi) + q\int \phi d\mu = P(0) + q\int \phi d\mu$$

for all $q \ge 0$. The proof follows. □

4. Dimension of infinitely generated self-affine sets

In this section, we prove Theorem B, that is, we show that the dimension of a typical infinitely generated self-affine set is a supremum of dimensions of its finitely generated subsets. We also examine when the projection of the Gibbs measure is a measure of maximal dimension. The reader is prompted to recall notation from §2.2.

Proof of Theorem B. Define $s_0 = \inf\{s : P(\varphi^s) \le 0\}$ and let $(I_\ell)_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of non-empty finite sets $I_\ell \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $I_\ell \subset I_{\ell+1}$ and $\Gamma \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^K I_\ell^k$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{N} = \bigcup_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} I_\ell$. Fix $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $0 < s_\ell \le s_0$ be such that $P(\varphi^{s_\ell}, I_\ell) = 0$. To show that $s_0 \le \sup_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} s_\ell$, take $s < s_0$. Since $P(\varphi^s) > 0$ and $P(\varphi^s, I_\ell) \to P(\varphi^s)$ by Proposition 3.2, we may choose $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $P(\varphi^s, I_{\ell_0}) > 0$. Therefore $s_{\ell_0} > s$, and, consequently, $s_0 = \sup_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} s_\ell$.

Since $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(\pi_{\mathbf{a}}(I_\ell^{\mathbb{N}})) = \min\{d, s_\ell\}$ for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$-almost all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$ by [7, Theorem 5.3] and $\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_{\mathbf{a}}(I_\ell^{\mathbb{N}}) \subset F_{\mathbf{a}}$, we have $\min\{d, s_0\} \le \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(F_{\mathbf{a}})$. To show that $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(F_{\mathbf{a}}) \le s_0$, take $s < \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(F_{\mathbf{a}})$. Choose $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 < \delta \le 1$ so that $s = m + \delta$ and let Δ be a closed ball such that $f_i(\Delta) \subset \Delta$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows from the definition of singular values that for each $\omega \in \Sigma_*$ we may cover $f_\omega(\Delta)$ with at most a constant times

$$\frac{\gamma_1(\omega)}{\gamma_{m+1}(\omega)} \frac{\gamma_2(\omega)}{\gamma_{m+1}(\omega)} \cdots \frac{\gamma_m(\omega)}{\gamma_{m+1}(\omega)}$$

balls of radius $\gamma_{m+1}(\omega)$. Thus there exists $c \ge 1$ so that

$$\mathcal{H}^s_{2^{-k}}(F_{\mathbf{a}}) \le \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_k} \mathcal{H}^s_{2^{-k}}(f_\omega(\Delta)) \le c \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_k} \varphi^s(\omega)$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $\sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_k} \varphi^s(\omega) \ge 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough. Thus $P(\varphi^s) \ge 0$ and $s \ge s_0$ which finishes the proof. $\square$

Considering the projection $\pi_{\mathbf{a}}$, we denote the pushforward measure of $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ by $\pi_{\mathbf{a}}\mu$.

Theorem 4.1. *If* $(T_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$, *the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \le s \le d$, *there exists* $0 \le s_0 \le d$ *so that* $P(\varphi^{s_0}) = 0$, μ *is the Gibbs measure for* φ^{s_0} *so that* $\Lambda_\mu(\varphi^{s_0}) > -\infty$, *and* $F'_{\mathbf{a}} \subset F_{\mathbf{a}}$ *with* $\pi_{\mathbf{a}}\mu(F'_{\mathbf{a}}) > 0$, *then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(F'_{\mathbf{a}}) = \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(F_{\mathbf{a}})$$

for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$*-almost all* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$.

Proof. Let $s < t < s_0$ and recall that by Lemma 3.7, Theorem A, and Lemma 2.2, the measure μ is ergodic and satisfies $h_\mu + \Lambda_\mu(\varphi^{s_0}) = 0$. Hence, by Shannon-McMillan Theorem and Kingman's sub-additive ergodic theorem, we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \mu([\omega|_n])}{\log \varphi^t(\omega|_n)} > 1$$

for μ-almost all $\omega \in \Sigma$. Applying Egorov's theorem, we find for each $\varepsilon > 0$ a compact set $C \subset \Sigma$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\mu(C) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and $\mu([\omega|_n]) \le \varphi^t(\omega|_n)$ for all $\omega \in C$ and $n \ge n_0$. Now, according to [34, Proposition 3.1(i)], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbf{A}} \int_C \int_\Sigma \frac{d\mu(\omega) d\mu(\tau) d\mathbf{a}}{|\pi_{\mathbf{a}}(\omega) - \pi_{\mathbf{a}}(\tau)|^s} &\le c' \int_C \int_\Sigma \varphi^s(\omega \wedge \tau)^{-1} d\mu(\omega) d\mu(\tau) \\
&= c' \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_n} \varphi^s(\omega)^{-1} \mu([\omega]) \mu(C \cap [\mathtt{i}]) \\
&\le c \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_n} \varphi^s(\omega)^{-1} \varphi^t(\omega) \mu([\omega]) \\
&\le c \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-(t-s)n} < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

for some constants $c, c' > 0$. Observe that [34, Proposition 3.1(i)] is a refinement of [7, Lemma 3.1] and it generalises immediately to the infinite case. It follows that

$$\liminf_{r \downarrow 0} \frac{\log \pi_{\mathbf{a}}\mu(B(\pi_{\mathbf{a}}(\tau), r))}{\log r} = \sup\{t \ge 0 : \int_\Sigma \frac{d\mu(\omega)}{|\pi_{\mathbf{a}}(\omega) - \pi_{\mathbf{a}}(\tau)|^t} < \infty\} \ge s$$

for μ-almost all $\tau \in C$ and for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$-almost all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$. The proof is finished by recalling [8, Proposition 2.3(a)] and Theorem B. $\square$

To finish this section, we provide the reader with a sufficient condition to guarantee the finiteness of the Lyapunov exponent in Theorem 4.1. Recall that $s_\infty = \inf\{s : P(\varphi^s) < \infty\}$.

Lemma 4.2. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\|T_i\| < 1$*, the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \le s \le d$*,* $s_0 > s_\infty$*, and* μ *is the Gibbs measure for* φ^{s_0}*, then* $\Lambda_\mu(\varphi^{s_0}) > -\infty$*.*

Proof. Observe that since $P(\varphi^{s_0}) < \infty$ the Gibbs measure μ for φ^{s_0} exists by Theorems 3.5 and 3.6. To prove the claim, let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ be so that $m < s_0 \le m+1$. By the Gibbs property there is a constant $C \ge 1$ so that

$$\mu([\omega]) \le C\varphi^{s_0}(\omega)e^{-nP(\varphi^{s_0})}$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma_n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus

$$\log\frac{\varphi^{s_0}(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])} \ge nP(\varphi^{s_0}) - \log C \tag{4.1}$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma_n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

If $\max\{s_\infty, m\} < t < s_0$, then $P(\varphi^t) < \infty$ and $Z_n(\varphi^t) < \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by Lemma 3.1. As in (2.4), Jensen's inequality gives

$$\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n}\mu([\omega])\log\frac{\varphi^t(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])} \le \log\biggl(\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n}\varphi^t(\omega)\biggr) = \log Z_n(\varphi^t). \tag{4.2}$$

Since $\varphi^{s_0}(\omega) = \gamma_{m+1}(\omega)^{s_0-t}\varphi^t(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Sigma_*$ we have, by (4.1) and (4.2), that

$$\begin{aligned}\bigl(nP(\varphi^{s_0}) - \log C\bigr) &\le \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n}\mu([\omega])\biggl(\log\gamma_{m+1}(\omega)^{s_0-t} + \log\frac{\varphi^t(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])}\biggr)\\ &\le \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_n}\mu([\omega])\log\gamma_{m+1}(\omega)^{s_0-t} + \log Z_n(\varphi^t).\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{\omega\in J^n}\mu([\omega])\log\varphi^{s_0}(\omega) &\ge \tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{\omega\in I^n}\mu([\omega])\log\gamma_{m+1}(\omega)^{m+1}\\ &\ge \frac{(m+1)\bigl(nP(\varphi^{s_0}) - \log C - \log Z_n(\varphi^t)\bigr)}{n(s_0-t)}.\end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ we have

$$\Lambda_\mu(\varphi^{s_0}) \ge \frac{(m+1)\bigl(P(\varphi^{s_0}) - P(\varphi^t)\bigr)}{s_0-t} > -\infty.$$

□

5. Multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem C. The upper bound is proved in Proposition 5.2 and the lower bound in Theorem 5.4. It is worth mentioning that the upper bound in Theorem C holds for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$.

5.1. Proof of the upper bound in Theorem C.

In this subsection we shall prove the upper bound in Theorem C. The reader is prompted to recall notation from §2.2 and §2.3. We begin with a lemma relating the dimension of $J_\Phi(\alpha)$ to the singular value function. Define

$$A_\Phi(\alpha, n, k) = \bigl\{\omega \in \Sigma_k : A_k\phi_i(\tau) \in B_n(\alpha_i) \text{ for all } \tau \in [\omega] \text{ and } i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}\bigr\}$$

for all $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 5.1. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\|T_i\| < 1$*,* $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *has summable variations,* $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathbb{N}}$*,* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$*,* $s < \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha))$*, and* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*, then there is* $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that*

$$\sum_{\omega\in A_\Phi(\alpha,n,k)}\varphi^s(\omega) > 1$$

for all $k \geq k_0$*.*

Proof. Let $\delta = \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \|T_i\|$ and set

$$D_\Phi(\alpha, n, k) = \big\{\omega \in \Sigma_k : \text{there is } \tau \in [\omega] \text{ such that } A_k\phi_i(\tau) \in B_{2n}(\alpha_i) \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\big\}$$

for all $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\lim_{k\to\infty} \operatorname{var}_k(A_k\phi_i) = 0$ we may choose k_1 so that $\operatorname{var}_k(A_k\phi_i) < (2n)^{-1}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and all $k \geq k_1$. Thus we have $D_\Phi(\alpha, n, k) \subset A_\Phi(\alpha, n, k)$ for all $k \geq k_1$. Since

$$J_\Phi(\alpha) \subset \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{k=l}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\omega \in D_\Phi(\alpha,n,k)} \pi_{\mathbf{a}}([\omega])$$

and $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) > s$ there is $l \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}\Bigg(\bigcap_{k=l}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\omega \in D_\Phi(\alpha,n,k)} \pi_{\mathbf{a}}([\omega])\Bigg) > s.$$

Hence, continuing as in the proof of Theorem B, we find a constant $c \geq 1$ so that

$$\mathcal{H}^s_{\delta^k}\Bigg(\bigcup_{\omega \in D_\Phi(\alpha,n,k)} \pi_{\mathbf{a}}([\omega])\Bigg) \leq c \sum_{\omega \in D_\Phi(\alpha,n,k)} \varphi^s(\omega)$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The claim follows. □

Proposition 5.2. *If* $(T_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < 1$*,* $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *has summable variations, and* $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathbb{N}}$*, then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \sup\Big\{D_k(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int A_i\phi_i d\mu \in B_n(\alpha_i) \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\Big\}$$

for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$*.*

Proof. Fix $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$, $s < \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha))$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. According to Lemma 5.1, there is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{\omega \in A_\Phi(\alpha,n,k)} \varphi^s(\omega) > 1$$

for all $k \geq k_0$. Let $k \geq k_0$ and choose a finite subset $F_\Phi(\alpha, n, k) \subset A_\Phi(\alpha, n, k)$ with $F(k) = \sum_{\omega \in F_\Phi(\alpha,n,k)} \varphi^s(\omega) \geq 1$. Define a compactly supported k-th level Bernoulli measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma)$ by setting

$$\mu([\omega]) = \begin{cases} \varphi^s(\omega)/F(k), & \text{if } \omega \in F_\Phi(\alpha, n, k), \\ 0, & \text{if } \omega \in \Sigma_k \setminus F_\Phi(\alpha, n, k) \end{cases}$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma_k$. It follows immediately that

$$\sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_k} \mu([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi^s(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])} = \log F(k) \geq 0$$

yielding $s \leq D_k(\mu)$. Since μ is supported on $\bigcup_{\omega \in F_\Phi(\alpha,n,k)} [\omega]$ and $A_k\phi_i(\tau) \in B_n(\alpha_i)$ for all $\omega \in F_\Phi(\alpha, n, k)$, $\tau \in [\omega]$, and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we also have

$$\int A_k\phi_i d\mu \in B_n(\alpha_i)$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. These observations imply the proof. □

5.2. **Symbolic tree structure in level sets.** The following proposition contains the essence of the proof of the lower bound in Theorem C.

Proposition 5.3. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$*, the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \le s \le d$*,* $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *has summable variations,* $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathbb{N}}$*, and*

$$s < \lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \sup\bigl\{D_k(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int A_i\phi_i d\mu \in B_n(\alpha_i) \text{ for all } i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}\bigr\},$$

then there exists a set $S \subset E_\Phi(\alpha)$*, a Borel probability measure* μ *supported on* S*, and a constant* $C \ge 1$*, such that* $\mu([\omega]) \le C\varphi^s(\omega)$ *for all* $\omega \in \Sigma_*$*.*

In fact, with this proposition, the lower bound in Theorem C follows almost immediately.

Theorem 5.4. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$*, the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \le s \le d$*,* $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *has summable variations, and* $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathbb{N}}$*, then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J^{\mathbf{a}}_\Phi(\alpha)) \ge \min\bigl\{d, \lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \sup\bigl\{D_k(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int A_i\phi_i d\mu \in B_n(\alpha_i) \text{ for all } i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}\bigr\}\bigr\}$$

for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$*-almost all* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$*.*

Proof. Let $s > 0$ be as in Proposition 5.3. Applying the measure given by Proposition 5.3 in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we get $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(\pi_{\mathbf{a}}(S)) \ge s$ for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$-almost all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$, where $S \subset E_\Phi(\alpha)$ is as in Proposition 5.3. Thus $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J^{\mathbf{a}}_\Phi(\alpha)) \ge s$ for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$-almost all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$. □

In the course of the proof of Proposition 5.3, we shall rely on the concept of $\mathcal{M}$-trees. This approach is inspired by a similar notion discussed by Furstenberg in [19]. We shall now define all the required concepts.

If $\omega, \tau \in \Sigma_* \cup \Sigma$ so that $\omega \wedge \tau = \omega$, then we write $\omega \preccurlyeq \tau$. This defines a partial order on Σ_*. Let $\mathbb{X} \subset \Sigma_*$ be an antichain with respect to $\preccurlyeq$. If there is a function $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}}\colon \mathbb{X} \to [0,1]$ so that

$$\sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{X}} \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}}(\omega) = 1,$$

then the ordered pair $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}})$ is called an $\mathcal{M}$*-tree.* An $\mathcal{M}$-tree $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}})$ is said to be *finite* if $\mathbb{X}$ is a finite set. If $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}})$ and $(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Y}})$ are $\mathcal{M}$-trees so that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}}(\omega) = \sum_{\tau\in\{\kappa\in\mathbb{Y}:\omega\preccurlyeq\kappa\}} \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Y}}(\tau)$$

for all $\omega \in \mathbb{X}$, then we write $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}}) \preccurlyeq (\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Y}})$. This defines a partial order on the collection of all $\mathcal{M}$-trees.

Next we shall define a limit for certain $\mathcal{M}$-tree sequences. If $((\mathbb{X}_n, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}_n}))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a chain of finite $\mathcal{M}$-trees so that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \min\{|\omega| : \omega \in \mathbb{X}_n\} = \infty$, then the limit of that sequence is defined to be

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} (\mathbb{X}_n, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}_n}) = (\mathbb{X}_\infty, \mathcal{M}_\infty),$$

where

$$\mathbb{X}_\infty = \{\tau \in \Sigma : \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ there is } \omega \in \mathbb{X}_n \text{ so that } \omega \preccurlyeq \tau\}$$

and $\mathcal{M}_\infty$ is a Borel probability measure supported on $\mathbb{X}_\infty$ defined as follows. Observe first that since each $\mathbb{X}_n$ is a finite antichain, it is readily checked that the collection

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{X}_\infty) = \{\emptyset, X_\infty\} \cup \{[\omega] \cap \mathbb{X}_\infty : \omega \in \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{X}_n\}$$

is a semi-algebra of subsets of $\mathbb{X}_\infty$. Moreover, since $\lim_{n\to\infty}\min\{|\omega| : \omega\in\mathbb{X}_n\} = \infty$, it is clear that this semi-algebra generates the Borel σ-algebra restricted to $\mathbb{X}_\infty$. We define $\mathcal{M}_\infty$ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{X}_\infty)$ by setting $\mathcal{M}_\infty(\emptyset) = 0$, $\mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathbb{X}_\infty) = 1$, and

$$\mathcal{M}_\infty\left([\omega]\cap\mathbb{X}_\infty\right) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}_n}(\omega).$$

for all $\omega\in\mathbb{X}_n$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$. It follows from the fact that $(\mathbb{X}_n, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}_n}) \preccurlyeq \left(\mathbb{X}_{n+1}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{X}_{n+1}}\right)$ for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, that this set function is well-defined and countably additive. Thus $\mathcal{M}_\infty$ extends to a measure on Σ.

Finally, given a subset $\Omega\subset\Sigma_*\cup\Sigma$ let $\mathbb{D}(\Omega)\subset\mathbb{N}$ be the collection of all digits contained within words from Ω, that is, $\mathbb{D}(\Omega) = \{l\in\mathbb{N} : \text{there is } \omega\in\Omega \text{ with } \omega_i = l \text{ for some } i\}$.

Proof of Proposition 5.3. We begin by noting that, without loss of generality, we may assume that if ϕ is in the sequence Φ, then also $-\phi$ is in Φ. Indeed, if $\Phi = (\phi_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, and the right-hand side of the inequality in the formulation of Proposition 5.3 is denoted by $D(\Phi,\alpha)$, then we clearly have $D(\Phi,\alpha) = D(\Phi',\alpha')$, where $\Phi' = (\phi_i')_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\alpha' = (\alpha_i')_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ are defined so that $\phi_{2i}' = \phi_i$, $\phi_{2i-1}' = -\phi_i$, $\alpha_{2i}' = \alpha_i$, $\alpha_{2i-1}' = -\alpha_i$ for all $i\in\mathbb{N}$.

Choose $s < t < D(\Phi,\alpha)$ and define

$$A_i = \sup\{|\phi(\omega)| : \omega\in[\tau] \text{ and } \tau\in\mathbb{D}(\Gamma\cup\{1\})\} \tag{5.1}$$

for all $i\in\mathbb{N}$. For each $n\in\mathbb{N}$ we choose $k = k(n) \geq 4Kn\left(\max_{i\leq n} A_i + 1\right)$ so that $\mathrm{var}_{k(n)}A_{k(n)}\phi_i < \frac{1}{2n}$ for all $i\in\{1,\dots,n\}$ and there exists $\nu_n\in\mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma)$ with $D_k(\nu_n) > t$ and

$$\int A_k\phi_i d\nu_n \in B_{2n}(\alpha_i) \tag{5.2}$$

for all $i\in\{1,\dots,n\}$. Let $\rho_n\in\mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma)$ be the compactly supported $k(n)$-th level Bernoulli measure given by

$$\rho_n([\omega_1\cdots\omega_{k(n)q}]) = \prod_{j=0}^{q-1}\nu_n\left([\omega_{jk(n)+1}\cdots\omega_{(j+1)k(n)}]\right).$$

For each potential ϕ_i we define a k-th level locally constant potential $\underline{A}_k\phi_i$ by

$$\underline{A}_k\phi_i(\omega) = \inf\Big\{\frac{1}{k}\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\phi_i(\sigma^l\tau) : \tau_j = \omega_j \text{ for } j\in\{1,\dots,k\}\Big\}.$$

Note that $A_k\phi_i(\omega) - \mathrm{var}_k A_k\phi_i \leq \underline{A}_k\phi_i(\omega) \leq A_k\phi_i(\omega)$ for all $\omega\in\Sigma$ and $i\in\mathbb{N}$. Since $\mathrm{var}_k A_k(\phi_i) < \frac{1}{2n}$ it follows from (5.2) that

$$\int \underline{A}_k\phi_i d\rho_n \in B_n(\alpha_i)$$

for all $i\in\{1,\dots,n\}$. Moreover, it is immediate from $D_k(\nu_n) > t$ that

$$\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_{k(n)}}\rho_n(\omega)\log\frac{\varphi^t(\omega)}{\rho_n(\omega)} > 0.$$

We let $\mathcal{D}(n) = \left\{\omega\in\Sigma_{k(n)} : \rho_n(\omega) > 0\right\}$. Since $\rho_n\in\mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma)$ the number of words in $\mathcal{D}(n)$ is finite. Hence, for each n there is a finite set of digits $\mathbb{D}^*(n)\subset\mathbb{N}$ defined by

$$\mathbb{D}^*(n) = \mathbb{D}\left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{n+2}\mathcal{D}(l)\cup\{1\}\cup\Gamma\right).$$

Since we also have $\mathrm{var}_1\phi_i < \infty$ the quantities

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}(n) &= \sup\big\{|\phi_i(\tau)| : \tau\in[\omega] \text{ for some } \omega\in\mathbb{D}^*(n) \text{ and } i\in\{1,\dots,n\}\big\},\\ \mathcal{B}(n) &= \sup\{\rho_n(\omega)^{-1} : \omega\in\mathcal{D}(n)\}\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

are both finite. By Kolmogorov's strong law of large numbers, we have

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=0}^{N-1}\log\frac{\varphi^t(\omega_{jk(n)+1}\cdots\omega_{(j+1)k(n)})}{\rho_n([\omega_{jk(n)+1}\cdots\omega_{(j+1)k(n)}])}=\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma_{k(n)}}\rho_n(\tau)\log\frac{\varphi^t(\tau)}{\rho_n([\tau])}>0$$

for ρ_n-almost all $\omega\in\Sigma$, and

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=0}^{N-1}\underline{A}_{k(n)}\phi_i(\sigma^{jk(n)}\omega)\in B_n(\alpha_i)$$

and for all $i\in\{1,\dots,n\}$. By Egorov's theorem we find $S_n\subset\operatorname{supp}(\rho_n)$ with $\rho_n(S_n)>1/2$ so that each of the above convergences are uniform upon S_n. Hence there is $L(n)\in\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\begin{gathered}\prod_{j=0}^{N-1}\varphi^t(\omega_{jk(n)+1}\cdots\omega_{(j+1)k(n)})>\prod_{j=0}^{N-1}\rho_n([\omega_{jk(n)+1}\cdots\omega_{(j+1)k(n)}]),\\ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=0}^{N-1}\underline{A}_{k(n)}\phi_i(\sigma^{jk(n)}\omega)\in B_n(\alpha_i)\text{ for }i\in\{1,\dots,n\}.\end{gathered}\tag{5.4}$$

for all $\omega\in S_n$ and all $N\geq L(n)$. We also let $M(n)=\max\left\{\varphi^t(\tau)^{-1}:[\tau]\cap\operatorname{supp}(\rho_n)\neq\emptyset\right\}$.

For every $\alpha,\beta\in\Sigma_*$, according to the quasi-multiplicativity of φ^t, there exists $\omega\in\Gamma$ such that

$$\varphi^t(\alpha\omega\beta)\geq c(t)\varphi^t(\alpha)\varphi^t(\beta),$$

where $c(t)>0$ is a constant depending only on t. We let $\alpha\star\beta$ denote the word $\alpha\omega\beta$, so $\varphi^t(\alpha\star\beta)\geq c(t)\varphi^t(\alpha)\varphi^t(\beta)$. Note that for any given $\alpha,\beta\in\Sigma_*$ there are at most $K=\max\{|\omega|:\omega\in\Gamma\}$ finite words $\beta'\in\Sigma_*$ with $\alpha\star\beta'=\alpha\star\beta$ (including β itself). We also write $\alpha\star\beta\star\omega=(\alpha\star\beta)\star\omega$.

Our aim is to construct a sequence of $\mathcal{M}$-trees $((\mathbb{T}_n,\mathcal{M}_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}}$ with $(\mathbb{T}_{n-1},\mathcal{M}_{n-1})\preccurlyeq(\mathbb{T}_n,\mathcal{M}_n)$ for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, along with functions $(\Psi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of the form $\Psi_n\colon\mathbb{T}_n\to\Sigma_*$, together with a sequence $(\gamma_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with the property that every $\tau\in\mathbb{T}_n$ satisfies $\gamma_n-K\leq|\Psi_n(\tau)|\leq\gamma_n$.

We begin by letting $\mathbb{T}_0=\{\emptyset\}$, $\mathcal{M}_0(\emptyset)=1$, $\Psi_0=\{\emptyset\mapsto\emptyset\}$, and $\gamma_0=0$. Suppose we have defined $(\mathcal{M}_{n-1},\mathbb{T}_{n-1})$, $\Psi_{n-1}\colon\mathbb{T}_{n-1}\to\Sigma_*$, and γ_{n-1} with the required properties. For each $\omega\in\mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ we let

$$\mathbb{Z}_{n-1}(\omega)=\{\tau\in\mathbb{T}_{n-1}:\Psi_{n-1}(\tau)\preccurlyeq\Psi_{n-1}(\omega)\text{ or }\Psi_{n-1}(\omega)\preccurlyeq\Psi_{n-1}(\tau)\}.$$

We shall construct $(\mathcal{M}_n,\mathbb{T}_n)$, $\Psi_n\colon\mathbb{T}_n\to\Sigma_*$, and γ_n as follows. First take $q_n\in\mathbb{N}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}q_n>{}&\frac{4M(n)^{L(n)}M(n+1)^{L(n+1)}}{\min\{\varphi^t(\Psi_{n-1}(\omega)):\omega\in\mathbb{T}_{n-1}\}}+\max\{\#\Psi_{n-1}^{-1}(\omega):\omega\in\mathbb{T}_{n-1}\}\\&+nL(n+1)(\mathcal{A}(n)+1)(\mathcal{B}(n)+1)(\gamma_{n-1}+4K+k(n+1)+k(n+2)+1)\\&+\#\mathcal{D}(n)\#\mathcal{D}(n+1)\max\{\#\mathbb{Z}_{n-1}(\omega):\omega\in\mathbb{T}_{n-1}\}+q_{n-1}\\&+\#\mathcal{D}(n+1)\#\big(\{1\}\cup\Gamma\cup\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{D}(n))\cup\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{D}(n+1))\big)^{5K+k(n+1)+k(n)+2},\end{aligned}\tag{5.5}$$

where $\mathcal{A}(n)$ and $\mathcal{B}(n)$ are as in (5.3).

Let $\mathcal{F}_n=\{\tau\in\Sigma_{k(n)q_n}:[\tau]\cap S_n\neq\emptyset\}$ and $\eta(n)=\sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{F}_n}\rho_n([\tau])\geq\rho_n(S_n)>1/2$. Define

$$\mathcal{F}_n^l=\{\tau\in\Sigma_{k(n)l}:\text{there is }\beta\in\Sigma_{k(n)(q_n-l)}\text{ with }\tau\beta\in\mathcal{F}_n\}$$

for all $l\in\{1,\dots,q_n\}$. In the process of constructing $(\mathbb{T}_n,\mathcal{M}_n)$, Ψ_n, and γ_n, we shall construct a sequence of intermediary $\mathcal{M}$-trees $((\mathbb{T}_n^l,\mathcal{M}_n^l))_{l=0}^{q_n}$ so that $(\mathbb{T}_n^l,\mathcal{M}_n^l)\preccurlyeq(\mathbb{T}_n^{l+1},\mathcal{M}_n^{l+1})$ and

$$(\mathbb{T}_{n-1},\mathcal{M}_{n-1})\preccurlyeq(\mathbb{T}_n^l,\mathcal{M}_n^l)\preccurlyeq(\mathbb{T}_n,\mathcal{M}_n)\tag{5.6}$$

for all $l\in\{1,\dots,q_n\}$. In addition, we construct intermediary maps $\Psi_n^l\colon\mathbb{T}_n^l\to\Sigma_*$ and $(\gamma_n^l)_{l=0}^{q_n}$ so that $\gamma_n^l-K\leq|\Psi_n^l(\tau)|\leq\gamma_n^l$ for all $\tau\in\mathbb{T}_n^l$ and $\Psi_n^l(\omega^l)\preccurlyeq\Psi_n^{l+1}(\omega^{l+1})$ for all $\omega^l\in\mathbb{T}_n^l$, $\omega^{l+1}\in\mathbb{T}_n^{l+1}$, and $\omega^l\preccurlyeq\omega^{l+1}$.

First take $(\mathbb{T}_n^0, \mathcal{M}_n^0) = (\mathbb{T}_{n-1}, \mathcal{M}_{n-1})$, $\Psi_n^0 = \Psi_{n-1}$, and $\gamma_n^0 = \gamma_{n-1}$. Clearly $(\mathbb{T}_n^0, \mathcal{M}_n^0)$, Ψ_n^0, and γ_n^0 satisfy the required properties. For each $l \in \{1, \ldots, q_n\}$ we let

$$\mathbb{T}_n^l = \{\kappa\tau : \kappa \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1} \text{ and } \tau \in \mathcal{F}_n^l\}.$$

For each $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ we take the (unique) pair $\kappa \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_n^l$ with $\omega = \kappa\tau$ and let

$$\mathcal{M}_n^l(\omega) = \frac{\mathcal{M}_{n-1}(\kappa)}{\eta(n)} \sum_{\beta \in \{\alpha : \tau\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_n\}} \rho_n([\tau\beta]).$$

It is clear that $(\mathbb{T}_n^l, \mathcal{M}_n^l) \preccurlyeq (\mathbb{T}_n^{l+1}, \mathcal{M}_n^{l+1})$ and if we let $(\mathbb{T}_n, \mathcal{M}_n) = (\mathbb{T}_n^{q_n}, \mathcal{M}_n^{q_n})$, we have shown (5.6). We shall construct the functions $(\Psi_n^l)_{l=1}^{q_n}$ and numbers $(\gamma_n^l)_{l=1}^{q_n}$ recursively.

Suppose $l \in \{1, \ldots, q_n\}$ and we have constructed Ψ_n^{l-1} and γ_n^{l-1} satisfying the required properties. Define $\gamma_n^l = \gamma_n^{l-1} + 2K + k(n)$ and let $\omega = \kappa\tau \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ so that $\kappa \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_n^l$. Choose $\tau' \in \mathcal{F}_n^{l-1}$ so that $\tau' \preccurlyeq \tau$ and set $\omega' = \kappa\tau' \in \mathbb{T}_n^{l-1}$. Thus there exists $\tau_l \in \Sigma_{k(n)}$ so that $\omega = \omega'\tau_l$. The function Ψ_n^l is defined by setting

$$\Psi_n^l(\omega) = \Psi_n^{l-1}(\omega') \star \tau_l \star 1 \cdots 1,$$

where the length of $1 \cdots 1$ is $\gamma_n^l - K - |\Psi_n^{l-1}(\omega') \star \tau_l|$. Since $\gamma_n^{l-1} - K \le |\Psi_n^{l-1}(\omega')| \le \gamma_n^{l-1}$ we have $\gamma_n^{l-1} - K + k(n) \le |\Psi_n^l(\omega') \star \tau_l| \le \gamma_n^{l-1} + k(n) + K$. Thus $\Psi_n^l(\omega)$ is well-defined, the length of $1 \cdots 1$ is at most $2K$, and $\gamma_n^l - K \le |\Psi_n^l(\omega)| \le \gamma_n^l$. Moreover, if we let $c_0 = c(t)^2 \varphi^t(1 \cdots 1)$, where the length of $1 \cdots 1$ is $2K$, then a simple induction gives

$$\varphi^t(\Psi_{n-1}(\kappa)) \prod_{j=1}^{l} \varphi^t(\tau_j) \le c_0^{-l} \varphi^t(\Psi_n^l(\kappa\tau)), \tag{5.7}$$

where each τ_j has length $k(n)$. We emphasise that c_0 is independent of n and l. Recalling that $\mathbb{T}_n = \mathbb{T}_n^{q_n}$, we set $\Psi_n = \Psi_n^{q_n}$.

To finish the construction of $\mathcal{M}$-trees $((\mathbb{T}_n, \mathcal{M}_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}}$, functions $(\Psi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and the sequence $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, we shall show that

$$\max\{\#\mathbb{Z}_n^l(\omega) : \omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l\} \le q_{n-1}(2K)^{l + q_{n-1}} \tag{5.8}$$

for all $l \in \{1, \ldots, q_n\}$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$\mathbb{Z}_n^l(\omega) = \{\omega' \in \mathbb{T}_n^l : \Psi_n^l(\omega) \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\omega') \text{ or } \Psi_n^l(\omega') \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\omega)\}$$

for all $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$, $l \in \{1, \ldots, q_n\}$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Fix $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ and choose $\kappa \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_n^l$ so that $\omega = \kappa\tau$. Write $\tau = \tau_1 \cdots \tau_l$, where each $\tau_j \in \Sigma_{k(n)}$. Now suppose $\omega' \in \mathbb{Z}_n^l(\omega)$ and similarly take $\kappa' \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ and $\tau' = \tau_1' \cdots \tau_l' \in \mathcal{F}_n^l$ so that $\omega' = \kappa'\tau'$ and $\tau_j' \in \Sigma_{k(n)}$. It is clear that either $\Psi_{n-1}(\kappa) \preccurlyeq \Psi_{n-1}(\kappa')$ or $\Psi_{n-1}(\kappa') \preccurlyeq \Psi_{n-1}(\kappa)$. Thus we have $\kappa' \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}(\kappa)$. Now since either $\Psi_n^l(\omega) \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\omega')$ or $\Psi_n^l(\omega') \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\omega)$ and $|\Psi_n^{l-1}(\omega'')| \le \gamma_n^{l-1} < \gamma_n^l - K \le |\Psi_n^l(\omega)|$, we have $\Psi_n^{l-1}(\omega'') \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\omega)$, where $\omega'' = \kappa'\tau_1' \cdots \tau_{l-1}' \in \mathbb{T}_n^{l-1}$. Thus, for $j \le l-1$ there is a subword of $\Psi_n^l(\omega)$ which starts between positions $\gamma_n^{j-1} - K$ and $\gamma_n^{j-1} + K$ (or between positions $\gamma_{n-1} - K$ and $\gamma_{n-1} + K$ if $j = 1$). Also, $\tau_l' \in \mathcal{D}(n)$. This shows that

$$\#\mathbb{Z}_n^l(\omega) \le \#\mathbb{Z}_{n-1}(\kappa)(2K)^{l-1}\#\mathcal{D}(n).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\#\mathbb{Z}_n^l(\omega) : \omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l\} &\le \max\{\#\mathbb{Z}_{n-1}(\kappa) : \kappa \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}\}(2K)^{l-1}\#\mathcal{D}(n) \\ &= \max\{\#\mathbb{Z}_{n-1}^{q_{n-1}}(\kappa) : \omega \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}^{q_{n-1}}\}(2K)^{l-1}\#\mathcal{D}(n). \end{aligned}$$

Iterating this inequality and applying the definition of q_{n-1} we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\#\mathbb{Z}_n^l(\omega) : \omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l\} &\le \max\{\#\mathbb{Z}_{n-2}(\kappa) : \kappa \in \mathbb{T}_{n-2}\}(2K)^{q_{n-1}+l-2}\#\mathcal{D}(n-1)\#\mathcal{D}(n) \\ &\le q_{n-1}(2K)^{q_{n-1}+l}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $(T,\nu) = \lim_{n\to\infty}(\mathbb{T}_n, \mathcal{M}_n)$. Then T consists of all $\omega \in \Sigma$ such that there is a sequence $(\omega_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{T}_n$ such that $\omega_n \preccurlyeq \omega_{n+1} \preccurlyeq \omega$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows from the construction of $(\Psi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ that $\Psi_n(\omega_n) \preccurlyeq \Psi_{n+1}(\omega_{n+1})$ and $|\Psi_n(\omega_n)| < |\Psi_{n+1}(\omega_{n+1})|$. Thus, there is a unique infinite word $\Psi(\omega) \in \Sigma$ with $\Psi_n(\omega_n) \preccurlyeq \Psi(\omega)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This defines a map $\Psi\colon T \to \Sigma$. We let $S = \Psi(T)$ and $\mu = \nu \circ \Psi^{-1}$ and let $S^* = \{\omega \in \Sigma_* : [\omega] \cap S \neq \emptyset\}$.

In Lemmas 5.5–5.10 we shall verify that S and μ defined above have the required properties. The proof of Proposition 5.3 thus follows. □

Lemma 5.5. *In the setting of the proof of Proposition 5.3, let* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \in \{1,\dots,q_n\}$, *and* $\omega = \kappa\tau \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ *so that* $\kappa \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ *and* $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_n^l$. *Then*

$$\nu([\omega]) \le 2\nu([\kappa])M(n)^{L(n)}C_0^l\bigg(\frac{\varphi^t\left(\Psi_n^l(\omega)\right)}{\varphi^t(\Psi_{n-1}(\kappa))}\bigg).$$

Proof. Since $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ we have $\nu([\kappa]) = \mathcal{M}_{n-1}(\kappa)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\nu([\omega]) = \mathcal{M}_n^l(\omega) &= \frac{\mathcal{M}_{n-1}(\kappa)}{\eta(n)} \sum_{\beta\in\{\alpha:\tau\alpha\in\mathcal{F}_n\}} \rho_n([\tau\beta]) \\ &= \frac{\nu([\kappa])}{\eta(n)} \sum_{\beta\in\{\alpha:\tau\alpha\in\mathcal{F}_n\}} \rho_n([\tau])\rho_n([\beta]) \le 2\nu([\kappa])\rho_n([\tau]).\end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to show that

$$\rho_n([\tau]) = \prod_{j=1}^{l} \rho_n([\tau_j]) \le M(n)^{L(n)}C_0^l\bigg(\frac{\varphi^t\left(\Psi_n^l(\kappa\tau)\right)}{\varphi^t(\Psi_{n-1}(\kappa))}\bigg).$$

Thus, by (5.7), it suffices to show that

$$\prod_{j=1}^{l} \rho_n([\tau_j]) \le M(n)^{L(n)} \prod_{j=1}^{l} \varphi^t([\tau_j]). \tag{5.9}$$

Now either $l \ge L(n)$, in which case it follows from $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_n^l$ and (5.4) that

$$\prod_{j=1}^{l} \rho_n([\tau_j]) \le \prod_{j=1}^{l} \varphi^t([\tau_j]),$$

or $l < L(n)$, in which case we have

$$\prod_{j=1}^{l} \varphi^t([\tau_j])^{-1} \le M(n)^l \le M(n)^{L(n)}.$$

This shows (5.9) and thus completes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 5.6. *In the setting of the proof of Proposition 5.3, let* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \in \{1,\dots,q_n\}$, *and* $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$. *Then*

$$\nu([\omega]) \le q_{n-1}C_0^{q_{n-1}+l}\varphi^t\left(\Psi_n^l(\omega)\right).$$

Proof. Since $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ we may take $\kappa \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_n^l$ so that $\omega = \kappa\tau$, so by Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\nu([\omega]) \le 2\nu([\kappa])M(n)^{L(n)}C_0^l\bigg(\frac{\varphi^t\left(\Psi_n^l(\omega)\right)}{\varphi^t(\Psi_{n-1}(\kappa))}\bigg).$$

Moreover, since $\kappa \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_{n-2}^{q_{n-1}}$ there exists $\kappa_- \in \mathbb{T}_{n-2}$ and $\tau_- \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}^{q_{n-1}}$ so that $\kappa = \kappa_-\tau_-$. Applying Lemma 5.5 once more, we obtain

$$\nu([\kappa]) \le 2\nu([\kappa_-])M(n-1)^{L(n-1)}C_0^{q_{n-1}}\bigg(\frac{\varphi^t\left(\Psi_{n-1}^{q_{n-1}}(\kappa)\right)}{\varphi^t(\Psi_{n-2}(\kappa_-))}\bigg).$$

Combining these two estimates we get

$$\nu([\omega]) \leq \frac{4M(n-1)^{L(n-1)}M(n)^{L(n)}}{\varphi^t(\Psi_{n-2}(\kappa_-))} C_0^{q_{n-1}+l} \varphi^t\big(\Psi_n^l(\omega)\big).$$

Noting that the definition of q_{n-1} implies

$$q_{n-1} \geq \frac{4M(n-1)^{L(n-1)}M(n)^{L(n)}}{\min\{\varphi^t(\Psi_{n-2}(\kappa')) : \kappa' \in \mathbb{T}_{n-2}\}}$$

completes the proof. □

Lemma 5.7. *In the setting of the proof of Proposition 5.3, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \in \{1, \ldots, q_n\}$, and $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$. Then,*

$$\mu([\Psi_n^l(\omega)]) \leq q_{n-1}^2 \# \mathcal{D}(n)(2KC_0)^{q_{n-1}+l} \varphi^t\big(\Psi_n^l(\omega)\big).$$

Proof. Note that $\mu([\Psi_n^l(\omega)]) = \nu \circ \Psi^{-1}\big([\Psi_n^l(\omega)]\big)$. Moreover, $\Psi^{-1}\big([\Psi_n^l(\omega)]\big) \subset \bigcup [\eta]$, where the union is taken over all $\eta \in \mathbb{T}_n^{l+1}$ satisfying $\Psi_n^l(\omega) \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^{l+1}(\eta)$. This follows from the fact that every $\eta \in \mathbb{T}_n^{l+1}$ maps to a string $\Psi_n^{l+1}(\eta)$ of length $|\Psi_n^{l+1}(\eta)| \geq \gamma_n^{l+1} - K \geq \gamma_n^l \geq |\Psi_n^l(\omega)|$. Since

$$\nu([\eta]) \leq q_{n-1} C_0^{q_{n-1}+l+1} \varphi^t\big(\Psi_n^{l+1}(\eta)\big) \leq q_{n-1} C_0^{q_{n-1}+l+1} \varphi^t\big(\Psi_n^l(\omega)\big)$$

for all $\eta \in \mathbb{T}_n^{l+1}$ satisfying $\Psi_n^l(\omega) \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^{l+1}(\eta)$, it suffices to show that

$$\#\{\eta \in \mathbb{T}_n^{l+1} : \Psi_n^l(\omega) \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^{l+1}(\eta)\} \leq \#\mathcal{D}(n) q_{n-1} (2K)^{q_{n-1}+l}.$$

Now if $\eta \in \mathbb{T}_n^{l+1}$ satisfies $\Psi_n^l(\omega) \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^{l+1}(\eta)$, then there exists some $\eta_- \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ with $\eta_- \preccurlyeq \eta$ and $\Psi_n^l(\omega) \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\eta_-)$ or $\Psi_n^l(\eta_-) \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\omega)$. By Lemma 5.8, there are at most $q_{n-1}(2K)^{q_{n-1}+l}$ such η_-. Moreover, each such η_- is continued by at most $\#\mathcal{D}(n)$ strings in $\mathbb{T}_n^{l+1}$. This finishes the proof. □

Lemma 5.8. *In the setting of the proof of Proposition 5.3, let $\tau \in \Sigma_*$. If $n = n(\tau)$ is minimal so that $|\tau| \leq \gamma_n^l - K$ for some $l \in \{1, \ldots, q_n\}$ and let $l = l(\tau)$ be the least such l. Then $|\tau| > \gamma_n^l/2$ and*

$$\mu([\tau]) \leq q_{n-1}^3 (2KC_0)^{q_{n-1}+l} \varphi^t(\tau).$$

Proof. Since $|\tau| \leq \gamma_n^l - K$ every $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ satisfies $|\tau| \leq |\Psi_n^l(\omega)|$. Hence $\mu([\tau]) \leq \sum \mu\big([\Psi_n^l(\omega)]\big)$, where the sum is taken over all $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ with $\tau \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\omega)$. By Lemma 5.7, for each $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ with $\tau \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\omega)$, we have

$$\mu([\Psi_n^l(\omega)]) \leq q_{n-1}^2 \#\mathcal{D}(n)(2KC_0)^{q_{n-1}+l} \varphi^t\big(\Psi_n^l(\omega)\big) \leq q_{n-1}^2 \#\mathcal{D}(n)(2KC_0)^{q_{n-1}+l} \varphi^t(\tau).$$

As such, we must estimate the number of $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ with $\tau \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\omega)$. Either $l > 1$, in which case $|\tau| > \gamma_n^{l-1} - K$, or $l = 1$, in which case $|\tau| > \gamma_{n-1}^{q_{n-1}-1} - K$. In either case $|\tau| > \gamma_n^l - (5K + k(n) + k(n-1) + 2) \geq \gamma_n^l/2$. Now each $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ with $\tau \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\omega)$ is of length no more than γ_n^l and each of the final $|\Psi_n^l(\omega)| - |\tau|$ digits is chosen from, $\{1\} \cup \Gamma \cup \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{D}(n-1)) \cup \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{D}(n))$. Thus, there are at most

$$\#\left(\{1\} \cup \Gamma \cup \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{D}(n-1)) \cup \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{D}(n))\right)^{5K+k(n)+k(n-1)+2}$$

words $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$ with $\tau \preccurlyeq \Psi_n^l(\omega)$.

By the choice of q_{n-1}, we have

$$q_{n-1} > \#\mathcal{D}(n)\#\left(\{1\} \cup \Gamma \cup \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{D}(n-1)) \cup \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{D}(n))\right)^{5K+k(n)+k(n-1)+2}$$

and the claim follows. □

Lemma 5.9. *In the setting of the proof of Proposition 5.3, there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ with $\mu([\tau]) \leq C\varphi^s(\tau)$ for all $\tau \in \Sigma_*$.*

Proof. Clearly we may assume $\tau \in S^*$ since otherwise $\mu([\tau]) = 0$. Since each $\mathbb{T}_n$ consists of finitely many elements all of length at least γ_n, the set $S^* \cap \Sigma_m$ is finite for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. As such, it suffices to show that there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\mu([\tau]) \le \varphi^s(\tau)$ for all $\tau \in S^*$ with $|\tau| > N$. Choose N so that $(2KC_0)^{2/(N-1)} < (3/2)^{(t-s)}$ and $N^3(3/4)^{N(t-s)} < 1$ and let $M = \max\{N, \gamma_N\}$.

Given $\tau \in S^*$ with $|\tau| > N$ we let $n = n(\tau)$ to be minimal so that $|\tau| \le \gamma_n^l - K$ for some $l \in \{1, \ldots, q_n\}$ and take $l = l(\tau)$ to be the least such l. Then, by Lemma 5.8, we have $|\tau| > \gamma_n^l/2$ and

$$\mu([\tau]) \le q_{n-1}^3 (2KC_0)^{q_{n-1}+l} \varphi^t(\tau).$$

Hence $2|\tau| \ge \gamma_n^l \ge lk(n) + q_{n-1}k(n+1) \ge (l + q_{n-1})(n-1)$ and

$$\mu([\tau]) \le |\tau|^3 (2KC_0)^{|\tau|/(n-1)} \varphi^t(\tau).$$

Since $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$ we have $\varphi^t(\tau) \le 2^{-|\tau|(t-s)} \varphi^s(\tau)$ and so

$$\mu([\tau]) \le |\tau|^3 \big((2KC_0)^{2/(n-1)} 2^{-(t-s)}\big)^{|\tau|} \varphi^s(\tau).$$

Since $\gamma_n \ge \gamma_l^n \ge |\tau| > M \ge \gamma_N$ we have $n > N$, so $(2KC_0)^{2/(n-1)}(1/2)^{(t-s)} < (3/4)^{(t-s)}$. Moreover, since $|\tau| > N$ we have $|\tau|^3(3/4)^{|\tau|(t-s)} < 1$ and

$$\mu([\tau]) \le |\tau|^3 \big((2KC_0)^{2/(n-1)}(1/2)^{(t-s)}\big)^{|\tau|} \varphi^s(\tau) \le |\tau|^3 (3/4)^{|\tau|(t-s)} \varphi^s(\tau) \le \varphi^s(\tau)$$

finishing the proof. □

Lemma 5.10. *In the setting of the proof of Proposition 5.3, $S \subset E_\Phi(\alpha)$.*

Proof. Recall that we previously made the assumption that if ϕ_i is in the sequence Φ, then also $-\phi_i$ is in Φ. As such it suffices to fix ϕ_i and show that for each $\tau \in S$ we have

$$\liminf_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) \ge \alpha_i. \tag{5.10}$$

Given $m \ge \gamma_i$ we choose $n = n(m)$ to be maximal so that $\gamma_n \le m$ and choose $l = l(m) \le q_{n+1}$ to be maximal so that $\gamma_{n+1}^l \le m$. Since $\tau \in S = \Psi(T)$ there is $\omega \in \mathbb{T}_{n+1}^l$ with $\Psi_{n+1}^l(\omega) \preccurlyeq \tau$. It follows from the construction of $\mathbb{T}_{n+1}^l$ that $\omega = \kappa\omega^1\omega^2$, where $\kappa \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$, $\omega^1 \in \mathbb{T}_n^{q_n}$ and $\omega^2 \in \mathbb{T}_n^l$. We deal with these three segments seperately.

Since l is maximal we have $m < \gamma_{n+1}^{l+1}$, or $m < \gamma_{n+2}^1$ if $l = q_{n+1}$. This implies that $m - |\Psi_{n+1}^l(\omega)| \le 2K + k(n+1) + k(n+2) + 1$. It also follows that $\tau|_m$, the initial segment of τ of length m, consists entirely of digits from $\mathbb{D}^*(n) = \mathbb{D}\big(\bigcup_{l=1}^{n+2} \mathcal{D}(l) \cup \{1\} \cup \Gamma\big)$. Hence, for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ we have

$$-\phi_i(\sigma^j(\omega)) \le \mathcal{A}(n), \tag{5.11}$$

where $\mathcal{A}(n)$ is as in (5.3). Since $m \ge \gamma_n \ge q_n > n\mathcal{A}(n)(\gamma_{n-1} + 2K + k(n+1) + k(n+2) + 1)$, we thus get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=0}^{|\Psi_{n-1}(\kappa)|-1} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) + \sum_{j=|\Psi_{n+1}^l(\omega)|}^{m-1} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) &\ge -\gamma_{n-1}\mathcal{A}(n) - (2K + k(n+1) + k(n+2) + 1)\mathcal{A}(n) \\ &\ge -\frac{2m}{n}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Observe that $q_n > L(n)$ and $\omega^1 \in \mathbb{T}_n^{q_n}$ imply

$$\frac{1}{q_n} \sum_{j=0}^{q_n-1} \underline{A}_{k(n)}\phi_i(\sigma^{jk(n)}(\tilde{\omega}^1)) \in B_n(\alpha_i)$$

for all $\tilde{\omega}^1 \in [\omega^1]$. Here we have used the fact that $\underline{A}_{k(n)}\phi_i$ is constant on cylinders of length $k(n)$. Write ω^1 in the form $\omega^1 = \omega_1^1 \cdots \omega_{q_n}^1$ where each $\omega_\nu^1 \in \mathcal{D}(n) \subset \Sigma_{k(n)}$. It follows from the construction of Ψ_n, along with the fact that $\Psi_n(\kappa\omega^1) \preccurlyeq \tau$, that some set $\tilde{\mathbb{A}} \subset [\gamma_{n-1}, \gamma_n] \cap \mathbb{N}$ of cardinality q_n has the property that for each $j \in \tilde{\mathbb{A}}$ there is $\nu \in \{1, \dots, q_n\}$ such that $\sigma^j \tau \in [\omega_\nu^1]$. Let $\mathbb{A} = \tilde{\mathbb{A}} + \{0, 1, \dots, k(n) - 1\}$. We may choose $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}$ so that $\tau_\nu \in \{1\} \cup \mathbb{D}(\Gamma)$ for all integers $\nu \in [\gamma_{n-1} + 1, \gamma_n] \setminus (\mathbb{A} + 1)$. Since $\sigma^j(\tau) \in [\omega_\nu^1]$ for each $j \in \tilde{\mathbb{A}}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{q_n k(n)} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{A}} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) \geq \frac{1}{q_n} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{A}}^{q_n - 1} A_{k(n)} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) \geq \frac{1}{q_n} \sum_{\nu=0}^{q_n - 1} \underline{A}_{k(n)} \phi_i(\sigma^{\nu k(n)}(\tilde{\omega}^1)) \in B_n(\alpha_i).$$

By the construction of Ψ_n, the cardinality of $[\gamma_{n-1}, \gamma_n - 1] \setminus \mathbb{A}$ is at most $4Kq_n$, $k(n) \geq 4Kn$, and $m \geq \gamma_n \geq k(n) q_n \geq 4Knq_n$. Thus $\#\mathbb{A} \geq \gamma_n - \gamma_{n-1} - 4Kq_n \geq \gamma_n - \frac{2m}{n}$ and

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{A}} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) > \begin{cases} \gamma_n \left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right), & \text{if } \alpha_i \leq \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(\gamma_n - \frac{2m}{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right), & \text{if } \alpha_i > \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(\gamma_n - \frac{2m}{n}\right) n, & \text{if } \alpha_i = \infty. \end{cases}$$

As noted, for each $j \in [\gamma_{n-1}, \gamma_n - 1] \setminus \mathbb{A}$ there is $\eta \in \{1\} \cup \mathbb{D}(\Gamma)$ so that $\sigma^j \tau \in [\eta]$. Thus, for all such j, we have $\phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) \geq -A_i$, where A_i is as in (5.1). Moreover, since $k(n) \geq 4KnA_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $m \geq \gamma_n \geq k(n) q_n$, we get

$$\sum_{j \in [\gamma_{n-1}, \gamma_n - 1] \setminus \mathbb{A}} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) \geq -4KA_i q_n \geq -\frac{m}{n}.$$

Putting these inequalities together we have

$$\sum_{j=\gamma_{n-1}}^{\gamma_n - 1} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) > \begin{cases} \gamma_n \left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i \leq \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(\gamma_n - \frac{2m}{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i > \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(\gamma_n - \frac{2m}{n}\right) n - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i = \infty. \end{cases} \tag{5.13}$$

For the sum $\sum_{j=\gamma_n}^{|\Psi_{n+1}^l(\omega)|-1} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau))$, there are two cases. Either $l \geq L(n+1)$, in which case there exists $\tilde{\omega}^2 \in [\omega^2]$ with

$$\frac{1}{l} \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \underline{A}_{k(n+1)} \phi_i(\sigma^{jk(n+1)} \tilde{\omega}^2) \in B_n(\alpha_i), \tag{5.14}$$

so we may proceed as in the previous case to deduce

$$\sum_{j=\gamma_n}^{|\Psi_{n+1}^l(\omega)|-1} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) > \begin{cases} \left(|\Psi_{n+1}^l(\omega)| - \gamma_n\right)\left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i \leq \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(|\Psi_{n+1}^l(\omega)| - \gamma_n - \frac{2m}{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i > \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(|\Psi_{n+1}^l(\omega)| - \gamma_n - \frac{2m}{n}\right) n - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Recall that $m - |\Psi_{n+1}^l(\omega)| \leq 2K + k(n+1) + k(n+2) + 1 \leq \gamma_n / n \leq m/n$, so we may combine the above inequalities to obtain

$$\sum_{j=\gamma_n}^{|\Psi_{n+1}^l(\omega)|-1} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) > \begin{cases} (m - \gamma_n)\left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i \leq \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(m - \gamma_n - \frac{3m}{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i > \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(m - \gamma_n - \frac{3m}{n}\right) n - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i = \infty. \end{cases} \tag{5.15}$$

Combining (5.15) with (5.12) and (5.13) we conclude that whenever $l \geq L(n+1)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) > \begin{cases} \left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{3}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i \leq \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(1 - \frac{3}{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{3}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i > \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(1 - \frac{3}{n}\right) n - \frac{3}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i = \infty. \end{cases} \tag{5.16}$$

If $l \leq L(n+1)$, then we apply (5.11) once more to obtain

$$\sum_{j=\gamma_n}^{|\Psi_{n+1}^l(\omega)|-1} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) \geq -k(n+1) L(n+1) \mathcal{A}(n) \geq -\frac{\gamma_n}{n} \geq -\frac{m}{n}. \tag{5.17}$$

Notice that if $l \leq L(n+1)$, then $|\Psi^l_{n+1}(\omega)| - \gamma_n \leq (4K + k(n+1))L(n+1) \leq m/n$. We also have $m - |\Psi^l_{n+1}(\omega)| \leq m/n$, so $m - \gamma_n \leq 2m/n$ which combined with (5.13) gives

$$\sum_{j=\gamma_{n-1}}^{\gamma_n - 1} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) > \begin{cases} m\left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i \leq \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(m - \frac{4m}{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i > \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(m - \frac{4m}{n}\right) n - \frac{m}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i = \infty. \end{cases} \tag{5.18}$$

Combining (5.18) with (5.17) and (5.12) gives

$$\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \phi_i(\sigma^j(\tau)) > \begin{cases} \left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{3}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i \leq \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(1 - \frac{4}{n}\right)\left(\alpha_i - \frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{3}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i > \frac{1}{n}, \\ \left(1 - \frac{4}{n}\right) n - \frac{3}{n}, & \text{if } \alpha_i = \infty. \end{cases} \tag{5.19}$$

Since either (5.16) or (5.19) holds for all $m \geq \gamma_i$ and $n(m) \to \infty$ as $m \to \infty$ we have shown (5.10) and thus finished the proof. ☐

6. CONDITIONAL VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE FOR BOUNDED POTENTIALS

In this section we shall prove Theorem D. The progression from Theorem C to Theorem D relies upon the thermodynamic formalism developed in §3. The main challenge is to prove the upper bound which is given in §6.2–6.5.

We begin by proving some elementary lemmas in §6.1. The upper bound for the interior points of the spectrum for finitely many potentials is given in §6.2. In §6.3, we prove an upper-semicontinuity lemma which is a crucial technical tool in forthcoming sections. In Section §6.4, we prove a lemma which allows us to extend the upper bound to the boundary of the spectrum. The proof of the upper bound, for all points of the spectrum and for a countable infinity of potentials, is given in §6.5. The lower bound in Theorem D follows reasonably straightforwardly from Theorem C and it is proved in §6.6.

6.1. **Space of integrals with respect to invariant measures.** We restrict our attention to potentials $\Phi \colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^N$ taking values in some finite dimensional vector space. We begin by recalling an elementary lemma concerning convex sets of $\mathbb{R}^N$. If $\kappa \in \{-1,1\}^N$, then we define the open *κ-orthant* $O(\kappa)$ to be the set

$$O(\kappa) = \{(x_i)_{i=1}^N : \kappa_i \cdot x_i > 0 \text{ for each } i\}.$$

Lemma 6.1. *If C is a convex set, then $a \in \mathbb{R}^N$ lies in the interior of C if and only if $C \cap (a + O(\kappa)) \neq \emptyset$ for all $\kappa \in \{-1,1\}^N$.*

Suppose $\Phi = (\phi_i)_{i=1}^N$ is bounded with summable variations. If $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$, then we write $\int \Phi d\nu = (\int \phi_1 d\nu, \ldots, \int \phi_N d\nu)$. The space of integrals with respect to invariant measures is $\mathcal{P}(\Phi) = \{\int \Phi d\nu : \nu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$.

Lemma 6.2. *The set $\mathcal{P}(\Phi)$ is bounded and convex. Moreover, either $\mathcal{P}(\Phi)$ is contained within some $(N-1)$-dimensional hyperplane or $\mathcal{P}(\Phi) \subset \overline{\operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi))}$.*

Proof. The first statement follows immediately from the fact that the mapping $\nu \mapsto \int \Phi d\nu$ defined on $\mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ is bounded and affine and $\mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ is convex. The second statement follows from elementary properties of convex sets in Euclidean spaces. ☐

If $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ is finite, then we define $\mathcal{P}(\Phi, I) \subset \mathcal{P}(\Phi)$ by

$$\mathcal{P}(\Phi, I) = \{\Phi(\nu) : \nu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma) \text{ and } \nu(I^{\mathbb{N}}) = 1\},$$
$$\mathcal{P}_e(\Phi, I) = \{\Phi(\nu) : \nu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma) \text{ is ergodic and } \nu(I^{\mathbb{N}}) = 1\}.$$

Lemma 6.3. *It holds that*

$$\mathcal{P}(\Phi) \subset \overline{\bigcup_I \mathcal{P}_e(\Phi, I)},$$
$$\operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi)) \subset \bigcup_I \operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi, I)),$$

where the unions are taken over all finite subsets $I \subset \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$, $\alpha = \int \Phi d\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Phi)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Since each ϕ_i has summable variations we may choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\operatorname{var}_n(A_n\phi_i) < \varepsilon$. For each $\omega \in \mathbb{N}^n$ we let $\tilde{\omega} \in \Sigma$ denote the unique periodic point with $\sigma^{qn}(\tilde{\omega}) \in [\omega]$ for all $q \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Note that since ν is σ-invariant, $\int A_n\phi_i d\nu = \int \phi_i d\nu = \alpha_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Hence, as $\operatorname{var}_n(A_n\phi_i) < \varepsilon$ for each i, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_n} \nu([\omega]) \inf_\tau \{A_n\phi_i(\tau)\} &> \alpha_i - \varepsilon, \\ \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_n} \nu([\omega]) \sup_\tau \{A_n\phi_i(\tau)\} &< \alpha_i + \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Given a finite set $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ we let $c(\nu, I) = \sum_{\omega \in I^n} \nu([\omega])$. Note that I may be chosen so that $c(\nu, I)$ is arbitrarily close to one. Hence, (6.1) implies that there exists a finite set $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} c(\nu, I)^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in I^n} \nu([\omega]) \inf_\tau \{A_n\phi_i(\tau)\} &> \alpha_i - \varepsilon, \\ c(\nu, I)^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in I^n} \nu([\omega]) \sup_\tau \{A_n\phi_i(\tau)\} &< \alpha_i + \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Let μ' be the unique nth level Bernoulli measure which satisfies $\mu'([\omega]) = c(\nu, I)^{-1}\nu([\omega])$ for all $\omega \in I^n$. By (6.2), we have

$$\int A_n\phi_i d\mu' \in (\alpha_i - \varepsilon, \alpha_i + \varepsilon).$$

Now let $\mu = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mu' \circ \sigma^{-j}$. Since μ' is σ^n-invariant and ergodic with respect to σ^n, the measure μ is σ-invariant and ergodic with respect to σ. It is also clear that μ is supported on $I^{\mathbb{N}}$. Moreover, since

$$\int \phi_i d\mu = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \int \phi_i d\mu' \circ \sigma^{-j} = \int A_n\phi_i d\mu' \in (\alpha_i - \varepsilon, \alpha_i + \varepsilon)$$

for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, we have shown the first claim.

To prove the second claim, we apply Lemma 6.1. Indeed, if $\alpha \in \operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi))$, then $\mathcal{P}(\Phi) \cap (\alpha + O(\kappa)) \neq \emptyset$ for all $\kappa \in \{-1, 1\}^N$. Since each set $\alpha + O(\kappa)$ is open it follows from the first claim that for each $\kappa \in \{-1, 1\}^N$ there is a finite set $I(\kappa) \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\mathcal{P}(\Phi, I(\kappa)) \cap (\alpha + O(\kappa)) \neq \emptyset$. Letting $I = \bigcup_{\kappa \in \{-1,1\}^N} I(\kappa)$, we obtain a finite set with $\mathcal{P}(\Phi, I) \cap (\alpha + O(\kappa)) \neq \emptyset$ for all $\kappa \in \{-1, 1\}^N$. Moreover, since $\mathcal{P}(\Phi, I)$ is convex it follows from Lemma 6.1 that $\alpha \in \operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi, I))$. This completes the proof. □

6.2. Upper bound for interior points of the spectrum.

In this section we give the proof of the upper bound in Theorem D for interior points of the spectrum in the special case where there are only finitely many potentials.

Proposition 6.4. *If $(T_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ is such that $\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < 1$, the singular value function φ^s is quasi-multiplicative for all $0 \le s \le d$, $\Phi \colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is bounded with summable variations, and $\alpha \in \operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi))$, then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) \le \min\Big\{d, \max\Big\{s_\infty, \sup\{D(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int \Phi d\mu = \alpha\}\Big\}\Big\}$$

for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$.

The proof of Proposition 6.4 requires two lemmas. Lemma 6.5 uses Lemma 5.1 to relate the dimension of $J_\Phi(\alpha)$ to the pressure. Then Lemma 6.7 proves the upper bound by showing the existence of an appropriate maximising measure.

Lemma 6.5. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < 1$, $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$, $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^N$ *is bounded with summable variations,* $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$, *and* $s < \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha))$, *then*

$$P(\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}) \geq 0$$

for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Proof. Fix $s < \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi(\alpha))$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}^N$. By Lemma 5.1, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $k(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{\omega \in A_\Phi(\alpha,n,k)} \varphi^s(\omega) > 1$$

for all $k \geq k(n)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k} \varphi^s(\omega) \sup_{\tau\in[\omega]} \exp\left(S_n \langle q, \Phi-\alpha\rangle(\tau)\right) &= \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k} \varphi^s(\omega) \sup_{\tau\in[\omega]} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^N q_i\left(S_n\phi_i - n\alpha_i\right)\right) \\ &\geq \sum_{\omega\in A_\Phi(\alpha,n,k)} \varphi^s(\omega) \sup_{\tau\in[\omega]} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^N q_i\left(S_n\phi_i - n\alpha_i\right)\right) \\ &\geq \sum_{\omega\in A_\Phi(\alpha,n,k)} \varphi^s(\omega)\cdot e^{-N\overline{q}k/n} > e^{-N\overline{q}k/n},\end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{q} = \max_{i\in\{1,\ldots,N\}} q_i$. Hence

$$P(\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{k} \log\left(\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k} \varphi^s(\omega) \sup_{\tau\in[\omega]} \exp\left(S_n\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle(\tau)\right)\right) \geq -\frac{N\overline{q}}{n}.$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ completes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 6.6. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < 1$, *the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \leq s \leq d$, $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^N$ *is bounded with summable variations,* $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $q \in \mathbb{R}^N$, *and* $s > s_\infty$, *then the potential* $\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}$ *is quasi-multiplicative and* $P(\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}) < \infty$. *Moreover, if* μ *is the Gibbs measure for* $\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}$, *then* $\Lambda_\mu(\varphi^s) > -\infty$.

Proof. Observe that the quasi-multiplicativity follows immediately from Lemma 3.9. Since Φ is bounded we have $B = \sup\{|\langle q,\Phi(\omega)-\alpha\rangle| : \omega \in \Sigma\} < \infty$. This together with $P(\varphi^s) < \infty$ gives $P(\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}) = P < \infty$. Thus, by Theorems 3.5 and 3.6, the Gibbs measure μ for $\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}$ exists.

To prove the last claim, let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ be so that $m < s \leq m+1$. By the Gibbs property of μ there is a constant $C \geq 1$ so that

$$\mu([\omega]) \leq C\varphi^s(\omega) e_{\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}(\omega) e^{-nP} \leq C\varphi^s(\omega) e^{n(B-P)}$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma_n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, following the proof of Lemma 4.2, we get $\Lambda_\mu(\varphi^s) > -\infty$. □

Lemma 6.7. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < 1$, *the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \leq s \leq d$, $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^N$ *is bounded with summable variations,* $\alpha \in \mathrm{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi)) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, *and* $s > s_\infty$ *satisfies*

$$\inf_{q\in\mathbb{R}^N} P(\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}) \geq 0,$$

then there exists an ergodic invariant measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ *with* $\int \Phi d\mu = \alpha$ *and* $D(\mu) \geq s$.

Proof. We shall consider the function $F\colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $F(q) = P(\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q, \Phi-\alpha\rangle})$. Since $\alpha \in \operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi))$ we may apply the latter claim of Lemma 6.3 to obtain a finite subset $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\alpha \in \operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi, I))$. Since I is finite and all of the matrices T_i are non-singular we have $c = \min\{\gamma_d(T_i) : i \in I\} > 0$, $\varphi^s(\omega) \geq c^n$ for all $\omega \in \Sigma_n$, and $\Lambda_\mu(\varphi^s) \geq \log c > -\infty$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ with $\mu(I^{\mathbb{N}}) = 1$. Since $\alpha \in \operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi, I))$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ with $\overline{B_\varepsilon(\alpha)} \subset \mathcal{P}(\Phi, I)$. Hence for each $q \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$ we have $\alpha + \varepsilon q/\|q\| \in \mathcal{P}(\Phi, I)$ and there exists a measure $\nu_q \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ with $\Lambda_{\nu_q}(\varphi^s) \geq \log c$ satisfying

$$\int \Phi d\nu_q = \alpha + \varepsilon q/\|q\|.$$

By Lemma 2.2 and the boundedness of Φ, we have

$$F(q) \geq h_{\nu_q} + \left\langle q, \int \Phi d\nu_q - \alpha \right\rangle + \Lambda_{\nu_q}(\varphi^s) \geq \langle q, \varepsilon q/\|q\|\rangle + \log c = \varepsilon\|q\| + \log c.$$

Hence $F(q) \to \infty$, as $\|q\| \to \infty$. It follows from Lemma 3.10 that F attains a global minimum on a bounded set. Let $q(\alpha)$ denote a point at which this global minimum is attained.

By Lemma 6.6, the Gibbs measure μ_q for $\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}$ satisfies $\Lambda_{\mu_q}(\varphi^s) > -\infty$. Thus, applying Lemmas 3.7 and 2.2, we obtain

$$F(q) = h_{\mu_q} + \left\langle q, \int \Phi d\mu_q - \alpha \right\rangle + \Lambda_{\mu_q}(\varphi^s).$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.11 for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left.\frac{\partial F(q)}{\partial q_i}\right|_{q=q_*} &= \lim_{q_i \to q_i^*} \frac{P\big(\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q_*, \Phi-\alpha\rangle} \cdot e_{(q_i - q_i^*)(\phi_i - \alpha_i)}\big) - P\left(\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q_*,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}\right)}{q_i - q_i^*} \\ &= \left.\frac{\partial P\left((\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q_*,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}) \cdot e_{q_i(\phi_i-\alpha_i)}\right)}{\partial q_i}\right|_{q_i=0} = \int \phi_i d\mu_{q_*} - \alpha_i.\end{aligned}$$

Since F attains a minimum at $q(\alpha)$ it follows that $\int \phi_i d\mu_{q(\alpha)} = \alpha_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Thus, denoting $\mu = \mu_{q(\alpha)}$, we have $\int \Phi d\mu = \alpha$,

$$h_\mu + \Lambda_\mu(\varphi^s) = h_\mu + \left\langle q(\alpha), \int \Phi d\mu - \alpha \right\rangle + \Lambda_\mu(\varphi^s) = P(\varphi^s \cdot e_{\langle q,\Phi-\alpha\rangle}) \geq 0,$$

and $D(\mu) \geq s$. □

Proof of Proposition 6.4. Take $\alpha \in \operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi))$. Either $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) \leq s_\infty$, in which case the upper bound holds, or $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) > s_\infty$. If $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) > s_\infty$, then we may choose $s_\infty < s < \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha))$. By Lemmas 6.5 and 6.7 there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ with $D(\mu) \geq s$. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

6.3. **Quasi upper-semicontinuity lemma.**

Recall that because of the non-compactness of the shift space, the space of invariant probability measures is non-compact and the entropy is not upper semi-continuous. Nonetheless we do have the following proposition.

Proposition 6.8. *If $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ is such that $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < 1$, $(\mu_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence with $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\limsup_{n\to\infty} D(\mu_n) > s_\infty$, then there exists a sub-sequence $(\mu_{n_j})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ which is a weak* limit point of $\left(\mu_{n_j}\right)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and satisfies $D(\mu) \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} D(\mu_n)$.*

Before proving the proposition, we first prove a few elementary lemmas. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the set of all infinite probability vectors, that is, $\mathbb{P} = \left\{(q_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in [0,1]^{\mathbb{N}} : \sum_{i=1}^\infty q_i = 1\right\}$, and equip it with the usual product topology. If $a = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of numbers in $(0, 1)$ and $C > 0$, then we set $\mathbb{P}(a, C) = \{(q_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{P} : \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} q_i \log a_i \geq -C\}$.

Lemma 6.9. *If $a = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of numbers in $(0, 1)$ and $C > 0$, then $\mathbb{P}(a, C)$ is closed.*

Proof. Let $p = (p_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an accumulation point of $\mathbb{P}(a,C)$ and let $(p(n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence so that $p(n) = (p_i(n))_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{P}(a,C)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} p(n) = p$. Suppose for a reductio that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i \log a_i < -C$. Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i \log a_i < -C$. Choosing now $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i(n) \log a_i < -C$ for all $n \geq n_0$, we have arrived at a contradiction since $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i(n) \log a_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i(n) \log a_i < -C$ for $n \geq n_0$. □

Lemma 6.10. *If $a = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a non-increasing sequence of numbers in $(0,1)$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i < \infty$ and $C > 0$, the the function $F\colon \mathbb{P}(a,C) \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, defined by $F(q) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} q_i \log(a_i/q_i)$, is upper semi-continuous.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P}_k = \bigl\{(q_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{P} : q_i = 0 \text{ for all } i \in \{k+1, k+2, \ldots\}\bigr\}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and define a map $\xi_k\colon \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{P}_k$ by setting

$$\xi_k(q)_i = \begin{cases} q_i, & \text{if } i \in \{1,\ldots,k-1\}, \\ \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} q_j, & \text{if } i = k, \\ 0, & \text{if } i \in \{k+1, k+2, \ldots\}, \end{cases}$$

for all $q = (q_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{P}$. Take a sequence of vectors $(p(n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with each $p(n) = (p_i(n))_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{P}(a,C)$ along with $p = (p_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{P}$ such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} p_i(n) = p_i$. In particular, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i(n) \log a_i \geq -C$. Our goal is to show that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} F(p(n)) \leq F(p)$.

Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} p_i(n) = p_i$ for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,k-1\}$ and $\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} q_i = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q_i$ for all $q \in \mathbb{P}$ we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} \xi_k(p(n)) = \xi_k(p)$ with respect to the supremum metric. Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} F(\xi_k(p(n))) = F(\xi_k(p))$. Similarly, as in (2.4), we see that

$$\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} q_i \biggl(\log \frac{a_i}{q_i} - \log \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} a_j \biggr) \leq -\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} q_i \log \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} q_j,$$

and, consequently,

$$F(q) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q_i \log \frac{a_i}{q_i} + \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} q_i \log \frac{\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} a_j}{\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} q_j} = F(\xi_k(q)) - \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} q_i \log a_k + \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} q_i \log \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} a_j$$

for all $q \in \mathbb{P}(a,C)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Choosing $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} a_j < 1$ for all $k \geq k_0$, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} F(\xi_k(p)) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} F(\xi_k(p(n))) \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \bigl(F(p(n)) + \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i(n) \log a_k \bigr) \\ &\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} F(p(n)) + \liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i(n) \log a_k \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} F(p(n)) + \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i \log a_k \end{aligned}$$

for all $k \geq k_0$ by Fatou's lemma. Note that since the sequence $(a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is non-increasing we have $\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i \log a_k \geq \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i \log a_i$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and, by recalling Lemma 6.9, choose $k_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i \log a_i > -\varepsilon$ and $\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i \log \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} p_j > -\varepsilon$ for all $k \geq k_\varepsilon$. Since

$$F(p) - F(\xi_k(p)) = \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i \log \frac{a_i}{p_i} - \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i \log \frac{a_k}{\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} p_j} \geq \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i \log a_i + \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i \log \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} p_j > -2\varepsilon$$

for all $k \geq k_\varepsilon$ we have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} F(p(n)) \leq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \bigl(F(\xi_k(p)) - \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} p_i \log a_k \bigr) \leq \limsup_{k\to\infty} F(\xi_k(p)) + \varepsilon \leq F(p) + 3\varepsilon.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ finishes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 6.8. We begin by showing that $(\mu_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ has a convergent subsequence. Let $\delta = \limsup_{n\to\infty} D(\mu_n)$ and choose $m < \delta \le m+1$. If $\max\{s_\infty, m\} < t_0 < t_1 < \delta$, then there exists a subsequence $(n_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $D(\mu_{n_j}) > t_1$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{j\to\infty} D(\mu_{n_j}) = \delta$. It follows that $\Lambda_{\mu_{n_j}}(\varphi^{t_0}) \ge \Lambda_{\mu_{n_j}}(\varphi^{t_1}) > -\infty$ and

$$0 \le P_{\mu_{n_j}}(\varphi^{t_1}) \le \tfrac{1}{k} \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k} \mu_{n_j}([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi^{t_1}(\omega)}{\mu_{n_j}([\omega])}$$

for all $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, recalling (2.4) and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k} \mu_{n_j}([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi^{t_0}(\omega)}{\mu_{n_j}([\omega])} \le \log Z_k(\varphi^{t_0}) \le k \log Z_1(\varphi^{t_0}) < \infty$$

for all $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\varphi^{t_1}(\omega) = \varphi^{t_0}(\omega)\gamma_{m+1}(\omega)^{t_1-t_0}$ we get

$$\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k} \mu_{n_j}([\omega]) \log \gamma_{m+1}(\omega) \ge -\frac{k \log Z_1(\varphi^{t_0})}{t_1 - t_0} \tag{6.3}$$

for all $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $M \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\sum_{i=M}^{\infty} \gamma_{m+1}(T_i)^{m+1} \le \sum_{i=M}^{\infty} \varphi^{t_0}(T_i) < \varepsilon$. Thus for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there are only finitely many i's so that $\log \gamma_{m+1}(T_i) \ge (m+1)^{-1} \log \varepsilon$. Therefore, (6.3) implies that the sequence $(\mu_{n_j})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight and thus has a converging subsequence. We keep denoting the subsequence by $(\mu_{n_j})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ be its weak* limit.

Let $\max\{s_\infty, m\} < s < \delta$. Since $\varphi^s(\omega) \ge \gamma_{m+1}(\omega)^{m+1}$ for all $\omega \in \Sigma_k$ it follows from (6.3) that

$$\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k} \mu_{n_j}([\omega]) \log \varphi^s(\omega) \ge -\frac{k(m+1) \log Z_1(\varphi^{t_0})}{t_1 - t_0}$$

for all $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$. According to Lemma 6.9, the same estimate holds when the measure μ_{n_j} is replaced by μ. Thus $\Lambda_\mu(\varphi^s) \ge -(m+1)(t_1-t_0)^{-1} \log Z_1(\varphi^{t_0}) > -\infty$. Furthermore, since $s < \delta$ there is $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $D(\mu_{n_j}) > s$ for all $j \ge j_0$. Therefore, Lemma 6.10 implies

$$\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k} \mu([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi^s(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])} \ge \limsup_{j\to\infty} \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k} \mu_{n_j}([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi^s(\omega)}{\mu_{n_j}([\omega])} \ge 0$$

and $D(\mu) \ge s$. The proof is finished since $\max\{s_\infty, m\} < s < \limsup_{n\to\infty} D(\mu_n)$ was arbitrary. □

6.4. **Finitely many potentials lemma.** In this section we prove a technical lemma which, together with Proposition 6.8, allows us to prove the upper bound in Theorem D for boundary points of the spectrum.

Lemma 6.11. *If $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ is such that $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$, the singular value function φ^s is quasi-multiplicative for all $0 \le s \le d$, $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is bounded with summable variations, $\mathcal{P}(\Phi)$ is not contained within any $(N-1)$-dimensional hyperplane, and $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$, then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\gamma \in \mathrm{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi))$ with $|\alpha - \gamma| < \varepsilon$ and $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\gamma)) \ge \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) - \varepsilon$ for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$-almost all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$.*

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) - \varepsilon < s < t < \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha))$. By Lemma 6.2 and the first part of Lemma 6.3, we may choose $\beta \in \mathrm{int}\,(\mathcal{P}(\Phi)) \cap \mathcal{P}_e(\Phi, I)$, with respect to some finite subset $I \subset \mathbb{N}$, satisfying $|\beta - \alpha| < 1/n$. Since $\beta \in \mathcal{P}_e(\Phi, I)$ there is an ergodic invariant measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ with $\nu(I^{\mathbb{N}}) = 1$ and $\int \phi_i d\nu = \beta_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Since $\nu(I^{\mathbb{N}}) = 1$ we also have $\Lambda_\nu(\varphi^s) > -\infty$. By the sub-additive ergodic theorem there exist $\tau \in \Sigma$, a constant $\theta(\tau) > 0$, and $L(\tau) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|A_l \phi_i(\tau) - \beta_i| < l^{-1} \text{ and } \varphi^s(\tau|_l) \ge \theta(\tau)^l$$

for all $l \ge L(\tau)$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Choose $0 < \rho < \min\{1, \varepsilon/|\beta - \alpha|\}$ so that

$$2^{(1-\rho)(t-s)}\theta(\tau)^\rho > 1$$

and let $\gamma = \rho\beta + (1-\rho)\alpha$. Since $\beta \in \operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi))$ and $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$ we have $\gamma \in \operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi))$ by the elementary properties of convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Moreover, since $\rho < \varepsilon/|\beta - \alpha|$ we have $|\alpha - \gamma| < \varepsilon$. We shall now show that $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\gamma)) \ge \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) - \varepsilon$.

Since $t < \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\gamma))$, it follows from Lemma 5.1 that for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $q(l) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{\kappa \in A_\Phi(\alpha, l, q)} \varphi^t(\kappa) > 1.$$

for all $q \ge q(l)$. Since $\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$ and $s < t$ it follows that

$$\sum_{\kappa \in A_\Phi(\alpha, l, q)} \varphi^s(\kappa) > 2^{l(t-s)}.$$

for all $q \ge q(l)$. For every $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma_*$, according to the quasi-multiplicativity of φ^s, there exists $\omega \in \Gamma$ such that

$$\varphi^s(\alpha\omega\beta) \ge c\varphi^s(\alpha)\varphi^s(\beta),$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant depending only on s. As in §5.2, we write $\alpha\star\beta$ for $\alpha\omega\beta$. Note that for any given $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma_*$ there are at most $K = \max\{|\omega| : \omega \in \Gamma\}$ finite words $\beta' \in \Sigma_*$ with $\alpha \star \beta' = \alpha \star \beta$

Our choice of ρ implies that for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $A(l) > \max\{(1-\rho)^{-1}q(l), \rho^{-1}L(\tau), l\}$ such that

$$c\theta(\tau)\big(2^{(1-\rho)(t-s)}\theta(\tau)^\rho\big)^k > 1$$

for all $k \ge A(l)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\kappa \in A_\Phi(\alpha, l, \lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil)} \varphi^s(\kappa \star (\tau|_{\lceil k\rho\rceil})) &\ge c \sum_{\kappa \in A_\Phi(\alpha, l, \lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil)} \varphi^s(\kappa)\varphi^s(\tau|_{\lceil k\rho\rceil}) \\ &> c2^{\lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil(t-s)}\theta(\tau)^{\lceil \rho k\rceil} > c\theta(\tau)\big(2^{(1-\rho)(t-s)}\theta(\tau)^\rho\big)^k > 1\end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

for all for all $k \ge A(l)$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$. We shall temporarily fix $l \ge d$ and $k \ge A(l)$, and for each $\kappa \in A_\Phi(\alpha, l, \lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil)$ we let $r(\kappa)$ be $|\kappa \star (\tau|_{\lceil k\rho\rceil})| - \lceil k\rho\rceil$. Since $[\hat{\kappa}] \subset [\kappa]$ for $\hat{\kappa} = (\kappa \star (\tau|_{\lceil k\rho\rceil}))|_k$ we have

$$\lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil(\alpha_i - l^{-1}) < S_{\lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil}\phi_i(\omega) < \lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil(\alpha_i + l^{-1})$$

for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ by the definition of $A_\Phi(\alpha, l, \lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil)$. We also have

$$\lceil k\rho\rceil(\beta_i - l^{-1}) - (K+1)\|\phi_i\| < S_{k-r}\phi_i(\sigma^r(\omega)) < \lceil k\rho\rceil(\beta_i + l^{-1}) + (K+1)\|\phi_i\|.$$

Since $r - \lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil \le K$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil(\alpha_i - l^{-1}) + \lceil k\rho\rceil(\beta_i - l^{-1}) - (2K+1)\|\phi_i\| &< S_k\phi_i(\omega) \\ &< \lceil k\rho\rceil(\beta_i + l^{-1}) + (2K+1)\|\phi_i\| + \lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil(\alpha_i + l^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since $|\alpha_i|, |\beta| < \|\phi_i\|$, $\gamma_i = (1-\rho)\alpha_i + \rho\beta_i$, and $k \ge l$ we have

$$\gamma_i - l^{-1}\left((2K+3)\|\phi_i\| + 1\right) < A_k\phi_i(\omega) < \gamma_i + l^{-1}\left((2K+3)\|\phi_i\| + 1\right).$$

Hence, if $Q = ((2K+3)\max_{i \in \{1,\ldots,N\}} \|\phi_i\| + 1)^{-1}$, then we have $\hat{\kappa} \in A_\Phi(\gamma, n, k)$ for all $n \le \lfloor Ql\rfloor$. Since $\hat{\kappa}$ is an initial substring of $\kappa \star (\tau|_{\lceil k\rho\rceil})$ for any given $\kappa \in A_\Phi(\alpha, l, \lceil k(1-\rho)\rceil)$ it follows from (6.4) that

$$\sum_{\hat{\kappa} \in A_\Phi(\gamma, n, k)} \varphi^s(\hat{\kappa}) \ge \sum_{\kappa \in A_\Phi(\alpha, l, \lfloor k(1-\rho)\rfloor)} \varphi^s(\kappa \star (\tau|_{\lceil k\rho\rceil})) > 1$$

for all $n \le \lfloor Ql\rfloor$ and $k \ge A(l)$. For each n we choose $l(k) \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $n \le \lfloor Ql(n)\rfloor$ and let $B(n) = A(l(n))$. It follows that

$$\sum_{\hat{\kappa} \in A_\Phi(\gamma, n, k)} \varphi^s(\hat{\kappa}) > 1$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $k \geq B(n)$. As in the proof of Proposition 5.2, we get

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) - \varepsilon < s \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \sup\bigl\{D_k(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int A_k(\phi_i)d\mu \in B_n(\gamma_i) \text{ for all } i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}\bigr\}$$

for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$. Theorem C finishes the proof. □

6.5. **Proof of the upper bound in Theorem D.** For potentials $\Phi = (\phi_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ taking values in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we similarly write $\int \Phi d\nu = (\int \phi_1 d\nu, \int \phi_2 d\nu, \ldots)$ for all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\Phi) = \{\int \Phi d\nu : \nu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$. The closure of $\mathcal{P}(\Phi)$ with respect to the product topology is denoted by $\overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$.

The following proposition proves the upper bound in Theorem D. In Lemma 6.15, we show that if $\alpha \notin \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$, then $J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha) = \emptyset$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$.

Proposition 6.12. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$, *the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \leq s \leq d$, $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is bounded with summable variations, and* $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$, *then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) \leq \min\bigl\{d, \max\bigl\{s_\infty, \sup\{D(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma) \textit{ so that } \int \Phi d\mu = \alpha\}\bigr\}\bigr\}$$

for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$*-almost all* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$.

Dealing first with the special case in which Φ takes values in $\mathbb{R}^N$, we extend the upper bound for the interior points of the spectrum found in Proposition 6.4 to the closure of the spectrum. The proof of Proposition 6.12 is given after this.

Proposition 6.13. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$, *the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \leq s \leq d$, $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^N$ *is bounded with summable variations, and* $\alpha \in \overline{\operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi))}$, *then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) \leq \min\bigl\{d, \max\bigl\{s_\infty, \sup\{D(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma) \textit{ so that } \int \Phi d\mu = \alpha\}\bigr\}\bigr\}$$

for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$*-almost all* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$.

Proof. If $\operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi)) = \emptyset$, then there is nothing to prove, so we may assume that $\operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi)) \neq \emptyset$. Note that in this case, $\mathcal{P}(\Phi)$ cannot be contained within any $(N-1)$-dimensional hyperplane. In addition, if $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) \leq s_\infty$, then the conclusion of the proposition holds, so we may as well assume that $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) > s_\infty$.

Fix $\alpha \in \overline{\operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi))}$. By Lemma 6.11, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we may choose $\gamma_n \in \operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi))$ with $|\alpha - \gamma_n| < 1/n$ and $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\gamma_n)) \geq \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) - 1/n$ for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$-almost all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$. Since $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) > s_\infty$ we have $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\gamma_n)) - 1/n > s_\infty$ for all sufficiently large n. By Proposition 6.4 it follows that for all such n there is a measure $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ so that $\int \Phi d\mu_n = \gamma_n$ and

$$D(\mu_n) > \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\gamma_n)) - 1/n > s_\infty.$$

Now by Proposition 6.8 this implies that the sequence $(\mu_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ has a weak* limit $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ with $D(\mu) \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} D(\mu_n)$. That is, $D(\mu) = \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha))$ for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$-almost all $\mathbf{a}$. Moreover, since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma_n = \alpha$ we have $\int \Phi d\mu = \alpha$. □

Proposition 6.14. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$, *the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \leq s \leq d$, $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^N$ *is bounded with summable variations, and* $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$, *then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) \leq \min\bigl\{d, \max\bigl\{s_\infty, \sup\{D(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma) \textit{ so that } \int \Phi d\mu = \alpha\}\bigr\}\bigr\}$$

for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$*-almost all* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$.

Proof. We let $(\phi_i)_{i=1}^N$ denote the collection of real-valued maps with $\Phi(\omega) = (\phi_i(\omega))_{i=1}^N$ for each $\omega \in \Sigma$. We begin by taking the smallest possible integer $M \le N$ so that there is an M-dimensional affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^N$ which contains $\mathcal{P}(\Phi)$. Then there exist $(j_l)_{l=1}^M$ with $j_l \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ a tuple of reals $(\gamma_{il})_{l=0}^M$ such that

$$\int \phi_i d\mu = \gamma_{i0} + \sum_{l=1}^M \gamma_{il} \int \phi_{j_l} d\mu$$

for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ and all $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Now define $\Phi' \colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^M$ by setting

$$\Phi'(\omega) = (\phi_{j_l}(\omega))_{l=1}^M$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma$. Given $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^N \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$ we let $\alpha' = (\alpha_{j_l})_{l=1}^M$. It follows that $J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha) \subset J_{\Phi'}^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha')$. Moreover, by our choice of M, $\mathcal{P}(\Phi') \subset \mathbb{R}^M$ cannot be contained within any proper $(M-1)$-dimensional affine space. Thus, by Lemma 6.2 we have $\overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi')} = \overline{\operatorname{int}(\mathcal{P}(\Phi'))}$. Moreover, since $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$ we have $\alpha' \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi')}$. Consequently, by Proposition 6.13, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) &\le \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_{\Phi'}^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha')) \\ &\le \min\bigl\{d, \max\bigl\{s_\infty, \sup\{D(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int \Phi' d\mu = \alpha'\}\bigr\}\bigr\}\end{aligned}$$

for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$-almost all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$. Now given any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ with $\int \Phi' d\mu = \alpha'$ we have $\int \phi_{j_l} = \alpha_{j_l}$ for $l \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$. Thus

$$\int \phi_i d\mu = \gamma_{i0} + \sum_{l=1}^M \gamma_{il} \int \phi_{j_l} d\mu = \gamma_{i0} + \sum_{l=1}^M \gamma_{il} \alpha_{j_l} = \alpha_i$$

for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and, consequently, $\int \Phi d\mu = \alpha$. The proof is finished. □

Proof of Proposition 6.12. Take a bounded potential $\Phi \colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with summable variations and fix $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$. We shall apply Proposition 6.8 in a similar way to the proof of Proposition 6.13. Again, if $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) \le s_\infty$ then the conclusion of the proposition holds trivially, so we may as well assume that $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) > s_\infty$.

We take $\phi_i \colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ so that $\Phi = (\phi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $\Phi_n = (\phi_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $\alpha_n = (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n$. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha) \subset J_{\Phi_n}^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha_n)$. Thus, by applying Proposition 6.14 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) &\le \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_{\Phi_n}^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha_n)) \\ &\le \min\bigl\{d, \max\bigl\{s_\infty, \sup\{D(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int \Phi_n d\mu = \alpha_n\}\bigr\}\bigr\}\end{aligned}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) > s_\infty$ we see that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we may choose $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ so that

$$D(\mu_n) > \max\{\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)) - 1/n, s_\infty\}$$

and $\int \Phi_n d\mu_n = \alpha_n$. By applying Proposition 6.8 we see that the sequence $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a limit $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ with

$$D(\mu) \ge \limsup_{n \to \infty} D(\mu_n) \ge \dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J_\Phi^{\mathbf{a}}(\alpha)).$$

Moreover, since $\int \Phi_n d\mu = \alpha_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\int \Phi d\mu = \alpha$. The proof is finished. □

We finish this section by showing that $E_\Phi(\alpha) = \emptyset$ outside of the closure of the spectrum.

Lemma 6.15. *If $\Phi \colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded with summable variations and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $E_\Phi(\alpha) \ne \emptyset$, then $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that for each $q \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ such that

$$\int \phi_i d\mu \in (\alpha_i - 1/q, \alpha_i + 1/q)\,.$$

for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$. Now since each ϕ_i is uniformly continuous there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $\mathrm{var}_n(A_n \phi_i) < (2q)^{-1}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$ and $n \geq N_0$. Moreover, since $E_\Phi(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$ we may take $\omega \in E_\Phi(\alpha)$. In particular, there exists $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$ and $n \geq N_1$ we have $A_n\phi_i(\omega) \in (\alpha_i - (2q)^{-1}, \alpha_i + (2q)^{-1})$. From these two facts it follows that if we take $N = \max\{N_0, N_1\}$ and let $\tau \in \Sigma$ denote the σ^N fixed point with $\sigma^{lN}(\tau) \in [\omega|_N]$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, then

$$A_N\phi_i(\tau) \in (\alpha_i - 1/q, \alpha_i + 1/q)$$

for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$. Thus, if $\mu = N^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \delta_{\sigma^i(\tau)}$, then

$$\int \phi_i d\mu \in (\alpha_i - 1/q, \alpha_i + 1/q)$$

for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$. Moreover, since τ is a fixed point for σ^N we conclude that μ is σ-invariant. □

6.6. **Proof of the lower bound in Theorem D.**

In this section, we shall prove the lower bound in Theorem D.

Proposition 6.16. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < \frac{1}{2}$*, the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \leq s \leq d$*,* $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *if bounded with summable variations, and* $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$*, then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(J^{\mathbf{a}}_\Phi(\alpha)) \geq \min\bigl\{d, \max\bigl\{s_\infty, \sup\{D(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma) \textit{ so that } \int \Phi d\mu = \alpha\}\bigr\}\bigr\}$$

for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{A}}$*-almost all* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$*.*

By Theorem 5.4, to prove Proposition 6.16, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} \sup\bigl\{D_k(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int A_i\phi_i d\mu \in B_n(\alpha_i) \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\bigr\}$$
$$\geq \max\bigl\{s_\infty, \sup\{D(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int \Phi d\mu = \alpha\}\bigr\}.$$

This inequality is shown in the following two lemmas.

Lemma 6.17. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \|T_i\| < 1$*, the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \leq s \leq d$*,* $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is bounded with summable variations, and* $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$*, then*

$$D(\mu) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} \sup\bigl\{D_k(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma) \textit{ so that } \int A_i\phi_i d\mu \in B_n(\alpha_i) \textit{ for all } i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\bigr\}$$

for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ *with* $\int \Phi d\mu = \alpha$*.*

Proof. Fix $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma)$ with $\int \Phi d\mu = \alpha$ and let $0 \leq s < D(\mu)$. It follows that $P_\mu(\varphi^s) \geq 0$. Thus

$$\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k} \mu([\omega]) \log \frac{\varphi^s(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])} \geq 0$$

and $D_k(\mu) \geq s$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, since μ is σ-invariant we have

$$\int A_k\Phi d\mu = \int \Phi d\mu = \alpha \in B_n(\alpha)$$

for all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence

$$s < \lim_{k\to\infty} \sup\bigl\{D_k(\nu) : \nu \in \mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int A_i\phi_i d\nu \in B_n(\alpha_i) \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\bigr\}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ and $s \uparrow D(\mu)$ completes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 6.18. *If* $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is such that* $\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\|T_i\| < 1$*, the singular value function* φ^s *is quasi-multiplicative for all* $0 \le s \le d$*,* $\Phi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ *is bounded with summable variations, then*

$$s_\infty \le \lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} \sup\Big\{D_k(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma) \text{ so that } \int A_i\phi_i d\mu \in B_n(\alpha_i) \text{ for all } i \in \{1,\dots,n\}\Big\}$$

for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$*.*

Proof. It suffices to show that for any $s < s_\infty$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $k(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \ge k(n)$ there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^*_{\sigma^k}(\Sigma)$ with $D_k(\mu) \ge s$ and $\int A_k\phi_i d\mu \in B_n(\alpha_i)$ for $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$.

First take $k_0(n)$ so that $\mathrm{var}_k(A_k\phi_i) < (4n)^{-1}$ for all $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$. Let $\Phi^n\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the potential $(\phi_i)_{i=1}^n$. Since $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi)}$ we have $(\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Phi^n)} \subset \overline{\bigcup_I \mathcal{P}_e(\Phi^n, I)}$ by Lemma 6.3. Thus there exists an ergodic invariant measure ν with $\int \phi_i d\nu \in B_{4n}(\alpha_i)$ for all $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$. Since ν is ergodic we obtain $\tau \in \Sigma$ and $k(n) \ge k_0(n)$ such that for all $k \ge k(n)$ we have $A_k\phi_i(\tau) \in B_{4n}(\alpha_i)$. Since $k(n) \ge k_0(n)$ we have $A_k\phi_i(\kappa) \in B_{2n}(\alpha_i)$ for all $k \ge k(n)$ and $\kappa \in [\tau|_k]$. Now choose $\rho \in (0,1)$ sufficiently large that

$$\rho\big(\alpha_i - \tfrac{1}{2n}\big) - (1-\rho)\|\phi_i\| > \alpha_i - \tfrac{1}{n} \text{ and } \rho\big(\alpha_i + \tfrac{1}{2n}\big) + (1-\rho)\|\phi_i\| < \alpha_i + \tfrac{1}{n}.$$

for all $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$. It follows that for any $k \ge k(n)$, any measure $\tilde{\mu}$ with $\tilde{\mu}([\tau|_k]) = \rho$ will satisfy $\int A_k\phi_i d\tilde{\mu} \in B_n(\alpha_i)$ for all $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$.

Since $s < s_\infty$ we have $\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k}\varphi^s(\omega) = \infty$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As such, for each $k \ge k(n)$ we choose a finite subset $C(k) \subset \Sigma_k \setminus \{\tau|_k\}$ with

$$\sum_{\omega\in C(k)} \varphi^s(\omega) > (\varphi^s(\tau|_k))^{-\rho/(1-\rho)}.$$

Let μ denote the unique k-th level Bernoulli measure satisfying

$$\mu(\omega) = \begin{cases} (1-\rho)\varphi^s(\omega)/\sum_{\kappa\in C(k)}\varphi^s(\kappa), & \text{if } \omega \in C(k),\\ \rho, & \text{if } \omega = \tau|_k,\\ 0, & \text{if } \omega \notin C(k)\cup\{\tau|_k\}. \end{cases}$$

Since $\mu([\tau|_k]) = \rho$ we have $\int A_k\phi_i d\mu \in B_n(\alpha_i)$ for $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_k}\mu([\omega])\log\frac{\varphi^s(\omega)}{\mu([\omega])} &= \rho\log\frac{\varphi^s(\tau|_k)}{\rho} + \sum_{\omega\in C(k)}\frac{(1-\rho)\varphi^s(\omega)}{\sum_{\kappa\in C(k)}\varphi^s(\kappa)}\log\frac{\sum_{\kappa\in C(k)}\varphi^s(\kappa)}{(1-\rho)} \\ &\ge \rho\log\varphi^s(\tau|_k) + (1-\rho)\log\Big(\sum_{\kappa\in C(k)}\varphi^s(\kappa)\Big) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $D_k(\mu) > s$. This completes the proof of the lemma. ☐

REFERENCES

[1] J. Barral and D.-J. Feng. Weighted thermodynamical formalism and applications. 2009. preprint, arXiv:0909.4247v1.

[2] J. Barral and M. Mensi. Multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages on 'self-affine' symbolic spaces. *Nonlinearity*, 21(10):2409–2425, 2008.

[3] L. Barreira and B. Saussol. Variational principles and mixed multifractal spectra. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 353(10):3919–3944 (electronic), 2001.

[4] R. Bowen. Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms. *Lecture notes in mathematics*, 470, 1975.

[5] Y.-L. Cao, D.-J. Feng, and W. Huang. The thermodynamic formalism for sub-additive potentials. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 20(3):639–657, 2008.

[6] K. Falconer and A. Sloan. Continuity of subadditive pressure for self-affine sets. *Real Anal. Exchange*, 34(2):413–427, 2009.

[7] K. J. Falconer. The Hausdorff dimension of self-affine fractals. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 103(2):339–350, 1988.

[8] K. J. Falconer. *Techniques in Fractal Geometry.* John Wiley & Sons Ltd., England, 1997.

[9] A. Fan, L. Liao, J. Ma, and B. Wang. Dimension of Besicovitch-Eggleston sets in countable symbolic space. *Nonlinearity*, 23(5):1185–1197, 2010.

[10] A.-H. Fan, D.-J. Feng, and J. Wu. Recurrence, dimension and entropy. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 64(1):229–244, 2001.

[11] A.-H. Fan, T. Jordan, L. Liao, and M. Rams. Multifractal analysis for expanding interval maps with infinitely many branches. preprint, 2011.

[12] A.-H. Fan, L. Liao, and J. Ma. On the frequency of partial quotients of regular continued fractions. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 148(1):179–192, 2010.

[13] A.-H. Fan, L.-M. Liao, B.-W. Wang, and J. Wu. On Khintchine exponents and Lyapunov exponents of continued fractions. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 29(1):73–109, 2009.

[14] D.-J. Feng. Lyapunov exponents for products of matrices and multifractal analysis. II. General matrices. *Israel J. Math.*, 170:355–394, 2009.

[15] D.-J. Feng. Equilibrium states for factor maps between subshifts. *Adv. Math.*, 226(3):2470–2502, 2011.

[16] D.-J. Feng and A. Käenmäki. Equilibrium states for the pressure function for products of matrices. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 30(3):699–704, 2011.

[17] D.-J. Feng and K.-S. Lau. The pressure function for products of non-negative matrices. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 9(2):363–378, 2002.

[18] D.-J. Feng, K.-S. Lau, and J. Wu. Ergodic limits on the conformal repellers. *Adv. Math.*, 169(1):58–91, 2002.

[19] H. Furstenberg. Ergodic fractal measures and dimension conservation. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 28(2):405–422, 2008.

[20] G. Iommi and T. Jordan. Multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages for countable markov maps. preprint, arXiv:1003.2979v3, 2010.

[21] G. Iommi and Y. Yayama. Almost-additive thermodynamic formalism for countable Markov shifts. *Nonlinearity*, 25:165–191, 2012.

[22] J. Jaerisch and M. Kesseböhmer. Regularity of multifractal spectra of conformal iterated function systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 363(1):313–330, 2011.

[23] T. Jordan, M. Pollicott, and K. Simon. Hausdorff dimension for randomly perturbed self-affine attractors. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 270(2):519–544, 2007.

[24] T. Jordan and K. Simon. Multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages for some self-affine IFS. *Dyn. Syst.*, 22(4):469–483, 2007.

[25] A. Käenmäki. On natural invariant measures on generalised iterated function systems. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, 29(2):419–458, 2004.

[26] A. Käenmäki and M. Vilppolainen. Dimension and measures on sub-self-affine sets. *Monatsh. Math.*, 161:271–293, 2010.

[27] M. Kesseböhmer, S. Munday, and B. O. Stratmann. Strong renewal theorems and lyapunov spectra for α-farey and α-lüroth systems. preprint, arXiv:1006.5693v2, 2010.

[28] M. Kesseböhmer and B. O. Stratmann. A multifractal analysis for Stern-Brocot intervals, continued fractions and Diophantine growth rates. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 605:133–163, 2007.

[29] L. Olsen. Multifractal analysis of divergence points of deformed measure theoretical Birkhoff averages. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 82(12):1591–1649, 2003.

[30] L. Olsen. Multifractal analysis of divergence points of deformed measure theoretical Birkhoff averages. IV. Divergence points and packing dimension. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 132(8):650–678, 2008.

[31] Y. Pesin and H. Weiss. The multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages and large deviations. In *Global analysis of dynamical systems*, pages 419–431. Inst. Phys., Bristol, 2001.

[32] H. W. J. Reeve. Multifractal analysis for Birkhoff averages on Lalley-Gatzouras repellers. *Fund. Math.*, 212(1):71–93, 2011.

[33] H. W. J. Reeve. Infinite non-conformal iterated function systems. *Israel J. Math.*, 2012. to appear.

[34] B. Solomyak. Measure and dimension for some fractal families. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 124(3):531–546, 1998.

[35] P. Walters. *An Introduction to Ergodic Theory.* Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982.

ANTTI KÄENMÄKI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, P.O. BOX 35, FI-40014 UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ, FINLAND

E-mail address: `antti.kaenmaki@jyu.fi`

HENRY WJ REEVE, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, UNIVERSITY WALK, CLIFTON, BRISTOL, BS8 1TW, UK

E-mail address: `henrywjreeve@googlemail.com`